THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN SWEDISH SCHOOLS

Studies in Methods of Instruction and Outcomes

by

Ian Dunlop

1975

ALMQVIST & WIKSELL INTERNATIONAL
Stockholm – Sweden

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN SWEDISH SCHOOLS

Studies in Methods of Instruction and Outcomes

by

Ian Dunlop

Fil. lic., M.A.

BY DUE PERMISSION OF THE FACULTY
OF SOCIAL SCIENCES OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF STOCKHOLM

TO BE PUBLICLY DEFENDED IN
LECTURE ROOM 3, HOUSE B,
FISKARTORPSVÄGEN 160 B, FRESCATI,
ON MONDAY, MAY 26, 1975 AT 10 A.M.

THE DISPUTATION WILL TAKE PLACE
IN ENGLISH

Stockholm 1975

THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN SWEDISH SCHOOLS

Studies in Methods of Instruction and Outcomes

by

Ian Dunlop
M.B.E., M.A., fil. lic.

ALMQVIST & WIKSELL INTERNATIONAL
Stockholm – Sweden

UNIV.
LEIDEN
BIBL.

© 1975 Ian Dunlop, Almqvist & Wiksell International
Stockholm, Sweden

All rights reserved

ISBN 91-2200013-5

Printed in Sweden by Gotab, Kungälv 1975

To teachers of English in Swedish schools.
"Lang may their lum reek"

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It has often been said that research is a co-operative enterprise. Nowhere has this been truer than in the preparation of this thesis. I am deeply grateful to Professor Torsten Husén for all his help and encouragement over the years and for having involved me in the work of the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), firstly as chairman of the National Committee for Sweden for the English as a Foreign Language part of the IEA Six Subject International Survey, and then as a member of the International Committee for English. The empirical studies reported here have been made possible through the instruments constructed and the data collected by IEA. I am also therefore most grateful to all the members of the IEA staff for the constant help and advice they have afforded me and in particular would like to thank Dr. Neville Postlethwaite who as Executive Director of IEA provided me with much inspiring guidance. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Mr. Robert Liljefors who as the Technical Officer for Sweden was in charge of the administration of the IEA Six Subject Survey in Sweden and for whose untiring work and assistance I am deeply grateful. I should also like to express my gratitude to my colleagues of the International English Committee for their encouragement and forbearance over the years, particularly to the Chairman Mr. E. Glyn Lewis, formerly Co-Director of the Language Research Project, University of Swansea, to Dr. Clare Burstall, Deputy Director of the National Foundation for Educational Research in England and Wales and to Dr. Carolyn E. Massad of the Educational Testing Service, Princeton. The scoring of the Writing (Composition) and the Speaking (Fluency) was conducted by Dr. Burstall to whom I am extremely grateful for all the help and advice I have received on numerous occasions and I should like to express my profound thanks to Dr. Massad for allowing me to use the computations she made for the IEA International Report on English and for all her patience and assistance throughout the writing of this thesis. I have drawn heavily on the material from the IEA International Report (Lewis & Massad, 1975) in Chapter VI of this book and was able to do so at an early stage as my duties as a member of the International Committee included the reading and commenting on drafts for the International Report.

For their assistance and encouragement during the preparation of the IEA tests, I am also most grateful to the members of the English National Committee for Sweden: fil.lic. Hans Jalling, fil.lic. Sten Rönnberg, fil.mag. Anders Slettengren, fil.mag. Olof Warme.

I am most appreciative of the kind co-operation of the Principals of the Swedish Teacher Training Colleges who distributed my questionnaire on English teaching methods as I am of the time and trouble taken by lecturers in method at these colleges in replying to this questionnaire. This was all the more appreciated as this work was entirely voluntary and meant inroads into valuable spare time.

In the same way, I am most grateful to the teachers at the Malmö Teachers Conference in Spring 1973, who kindly assisted me by taking my Special Listening Comprehension Test.

Further, in the conduct of the follow-up studies necessary to this research I have had the advantage of the help and advice of my colleagues at the Institute for the Study of International Problems in Education at Stockholm University, in particular fil.lic. Ingrid Mattsson and fil.lic. Ingemar Fägerlind to whom I am most grateful. I would also like to express my thanks to the School of Education, Bristol University and its then Head of Research Unit, Mr. Alan Brimer for the trouble and care taken in gathering data and

reporting results concerning the administration of the Special Listening Comprehension Test to English schoolchildren. Lastly, I have had the privilege of receiving advice and encouragement from Dr. John B. Carroll, now Director of the L.L. Thurstone Psychometric Laboratory, Department of Psychology, University of North Carolina. Dr. Carroll planned and carried out the inter-rater reliability study and determined the weights for the composite scores for Writing and Speaking. I am extremely grateful for permission to use his material here.

It will be obvious from the above how much help I have received from many eminent people who have given freely of their time and energy. For this I am most deeply grateful. The faults in this thesis are my own; the credit is theirs.

Ian Dunlop
1975

CONTENTS

Chapter I	Introduction	11
Chapter II	Teaching Methods and the Language Learning Controversy	14
Chapter III	Attempts to Assess an Expert Definition of Teaching Methods	27
Chapter IV	Teacher Perception of Teaching Methods	34
Chapter V	Development of the IEA Cognitive Tests	57
Chapter VI	Achievement of Swedish Students – Including some International Comparisons	74
Chapter VII	The Special Listening Comprehension Test	100
Chapter VIII	Conclusions	114

Tables

Chapter III

Table III:1	Definition of LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T According to Sample of Experts	29
Table III:2	Grammar Teaching and Use of Mother Tongue in LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T	30
Table III:3	Classroom Time Given to Four Skills in LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T	31

Chapter IV

Table IV:1	Answers of Swedish Teachers to Questionnaires TQ 5 and TQ 7	34
Table IV:2	Students' Perception of Classroom Activities	37
Table IV:3	Numbers of Teachers Answering NBE Questionnaire Items 9–20	39
Table IV:4	Percentage of Total Teaching Time Given to Practising Different Skills at Each Grade Level, in Teachers' Perception	40
Table IV:5	Percentage of Teachers in *allmän* Courses with LEDM Approach	46
Table IV:6	Percentage of Teachers in *särskild* Courses with an LEDM Approach	48
Table IV:7	Approaches to Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary on which *grundskolan* Teachers Were Very Divided	48
Table IV:8	Percentage of Teachers in *fackskolan* with an LEDM Approach	50
Table IV:9	Approaches to Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary on which *fackskolan* Teachers Were Very Divided	50
Table IV:10	Percentages of Teachers in *gymnasium* with an LEDM Approach	54
Table IV:11	Approaches to Teaching Grammar on which *gymnasium* Teachers Were Very Divided	55

Chapter V

Table V:1	Reliabilities for Reading Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population II	71
Table V:2	Reliabilities for Listening Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population II	71
Table V:3	Reliabilities for Reading Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population IV	72
Table V:4	Reliabilities for Listening Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population IV	72

Chapter VI
Table VI:1 N's for Participation in the IEA English as a Foreign Language Study 74
Table VI:2 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Reading Total Test, Population II . . . 75
Table VI:3 Means and Standard Deviations for Reading Sub-Scores, Population II . . . 75
Table VI:4 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Listening Total Test and Sections I and II, Population II . . . 76
Table VI:5 Means and Standards Deviations for Listening Sub-Scores, Population II . . . 76
Table VI:6 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing, Population II 77
Table VI:7 Inter-rater Reliabilities for Part scores and Global Ratings: Writing . 78
Table VI:8 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing (Composition) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population II 79
Table VI:9 Means for Accuracy in Writing (Composition), Population II 79
Table VI:10 Rank Order of Countries in Accuracy of Writing (Composition), Population II . . . 80
Table VI:11 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Total Speaking and Sub-Scores, Population II . . . 80
Table VI:12 Rank Order of Countries for Structural Control and Oral Reading, Population II . . . 81
Table VI:13 Inter-rater Reliabilities for Part Scores and Global Rating: Speaking 82
Table VI:14 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Speaking (Fluency) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population II 83
Table VI:15 Means for Accuracy in Speaking (Fluency), Population II 83
Table VI:16 Rank Order of Countries for Total Speaking and for Sub-Scores, Population II . . . 83
Table VI:17 Distribution of Population II Samples over Grades, and Average Age for the Different Samples . . . 84
Table VI:18 Maximum Exposure to English of Population II Samples 84
Table VI:19 Rank Order of Countries for Hours and Years Exposure to English (the Country with the Greatest Number Being Shown as I in Each Case), Population II . . . 85
Table VI:20 Results Achieved by Swedish Students in Cognitive Tests, as Percentages of Total Scores, Population II . . . 86
Table VI:21 Intercorrelations of Cognitive Measures, Population II 87
Table VI:22 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Reading Total Test, Population IV . . . 87
Table VI:23 Means and Standard Deviations for Reading Sub-Scores, Population IV . . . 88
Table VI:24 Means, Standard Deviations, N's and Rank Order of Countries, Total Listening, Population IV . . . 88
Table VI:25 Means and Standard Deviations for Listening Sub-Scores, Population IV . . . 89
Table VI:26 Rank Order of Countries for Global Comprehension and Use of Tape Recorder – Whole Class, Population IV . . . 89
Table VI:27 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing Test, Population IV . 90

Table VI:28 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing (Composition) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population IV 90
Table VI:29 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Accuracy in Writing (Composition), Population IV 90
Table VI:30 Rank Order of Countries in Different Aspects of Writing (Composition), Population IV 91
Table VI:31 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Total Speaking and Sub-Scores, Population IV 91
Table VI:32 Rank Order of Countries in First Two Parts of Speaking Test, Population IV 92
Table VI:33 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Speaking (Fluency A) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population IV 92
Table VI:34 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Speaking (Fluency B) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population IV 92
Table VI:35 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Accuracy in Speaking (Fluency A), Population IV 93
Table VI:36 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Accuracy in Speaking (Fluency B), Population IV 93
Table VI:37 Rank Order of Countries in Different Aspects of the Speaking Test, Population IV 94
Table VI:38 Rank Order of Countries in All Four Skills, Population IV 94
Table VI:39 Percentages of Samples in Different Grades, and Average Ages for Samples, Population IV 94
Table VI:40 Maximum Exposure to English of Population IV Samples 95
Table VI:41 Rank Order of Countries for Hours and Years Exposure to English, Population IV 95
Table VI:42 Percentages of Age Group at School and Studying English, Population IV; Percentage of School Budget for Foreign Language Instruction, Populations II and IV 96
Table VI:43 Mean Scores in Cognitive Tests as Percentages of Total Scores: Swedish students, Population IV 97
Table VI:44 Comparison of Swedish Population II and Population IV Results on Identical Cognitive Tests 98
Table VI:45 Comparison of Volume of Production in Speech (Fluency) and Writing (Composition): Swedish students, Populations II and IV . . . 98
Table VI:46 Intercorrelations of Cognitive Measures: Swedish students, Population IV 99

Chapter VII
Table VII:1 Means, Standard Deviations, N's and Reliabilities for SLC Test, University Level 104
Table VII:2 Difficulty and Discrimination Indices for SLC Test, University Level 105
Table VII:3 Mean, Standard Deviation and Reliability for SLC Test, Teachers, together with Details of Teachers' Background 106
Table VII:4 Difficulty Index for SLC Test, Teachers 106
Table VII:5 Means and Standard deviations on EPV Test, English 15/16 Year Olds 107

Table VII:6 Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities for SLC Test together with Indices of Difficulty and Discrimination: Special Sample *gymnasium* and English 15/16 Year Olds 107
Table VII:7 Mean, Standard Deviation, Reliability and Difficulty and Discrimination Indices for SLC Test, English 17/18 Year Olds 108
Table VII:8 Difficult Items across Sample Groups: *gymnasium*, University, Swedish Teachers and English School Pupils 108
Table VII:9 Popular Distractors in Difficult SLC Items across Sample Groups . . 109

Diagrams

Chapter I
Diagram 1:1 The Swedish School System at the Time of the IEA Survey 12

Chapter V
Diagram V:1 Types of Validity 66

Appendix A Letter sent to lecturers in method
Summed responses to questionnaires administered to lecturers in teaching method 117
Appendix B Dichotomised responses to questionnaire administered to lecturers in teaching method 120
Appendix C Distribution of responses to teacher questionnaire (NBE) on teaching methods 126
Appendix D Special Listening Comprehension Test: multiple choice answers . . . 134
References 137

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

The object of these studies was:

(1) to investigate English Teaching Methods in Swedish Schools in May–June 1971 at the time of the IEA survey;
(2) to relate the teaching methods so investigated to the Language Learning Controversy in Sweden, particularly with reference to the so-called Direct Method;
(3) to establish whether and to what extent the results of English teaching in Swedish schools, at that time, could be termed satisfactory:
    (a) from an international point of view
    (b) in relation to the aims and objects of the Schools Curricula;

As part of that evaluation it was also decided to test Listening Comprehension (one of the major aims of the Curriculum) at an advanced level of English; and at the same time to validate a Task Performance type Listening Comprehension Test for use with Swedish speakers of English at the advanced level.

The data available for these studies were as follows:

the answers to Teacher Questionnaires administered as part of the IEA Survey;

the answers to Student Questionnaires administered in the IEA Survey;

the answers to a special questionnaire about Teaching Method, designed by the author and administered to a sample expert population;

the outcomes of the cognitive tests designed by the IEA International Committee for English as a Foreign Language;

the outcomes of the special Listening Comprehension Test designed by the author and administered both to Swedish students at the advanced level in English in schools and to English schoolchildren at two different age levels.

In order for international comparisons to be made the following populations were tested in each of the participating countries:

Population II

Students aged 14.00 to 14.11 at the time of testing. In Sweden, these students were spread equally over grades 7 and 8 in the Swedish Comprehensive School (henceforward referred to as *grundskolan*). It should be noted that "special education" students were excluded from the target population. These students, however, accounted for slightly less than 2 % of the age group.

Population IV

"All students who were in the terminal year of those full-time secondary education programs which were either pre-university programs or programs of the same length" (IEA Brochure, 1970). In Sweden, the grades included, therefore, were grade 3 of the Upper Stages of the Grammar School (henceforward referred to as *gymnasium*), and grade 2 of the Continuation School (henceforward referred to as *fackskolan*).

Sampling

The IEA samples for the Reading, Listening and Writing Tests were stratified probability samples drawn in two stages, the first stage being the drawing of schools and the second the drawing of students from selected schools. The sub-sample of students for the Speaking Test consisted of a judgement sample (cf. Peaker, 1975)

The following countries participated in the survey:

Belgium (French speaking students), Chile, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Hungary, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden and Thailand.

An international report has been prepared by Lewis and Massad (1975) and reference will be made to that report in ensuing chapters here. The main portion of the present book, however, is concerned with Swedish schools and therefore an outline of the Swedish School System at the time of the IEA Survey is given in Diagram 1:1.

Diagram 1:1 *The Swedish School System at the Time of the IEA Survey*

grundskolan (the Swedish Comprehensive School)

Grade	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Age	7+			Start English			Two different types of English Course: *allmän* (general) *särskild* (special)		
English periods per week:				2	5	4	4	3	3

fackskolan (the Continuation School)			*gymnasium* (Upper Stages of the Grammar School)		
Grade	1	2	1	2	3
Age	16+		16+		
	Two different types of English Course: *allmän* (general) *särskild* (special)				
English periods per week:	3	3	3	3*	3*

(* = or 2, depending on study track)

NOTE: the above does not include all parts of the Swedish School System; it only includes those parts referred to in the text of this book.

The courses in English differed between *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* and also within these types of schools according to which study track (e.g. Arts, Natural Sciences etc.) was being pursued.

Before describing the results of the investigation into English teaching methods and their outcomes as assessed by the cognitive tests, it is necessary first to consider the discussion that has been conducted in Sweden over the past decades as regards the teaching of English at all levels in schools and at universities, as otherwise it would be difficult to place the outcomes of this inquiry in perspective. The next chapter will therefore consider the Language Learning Controversy.

———————

To help the reader a list of Swedish organisations and documents referred to in the text is given below together with their acronyms:

SÖ = National Board of Education for Sweden = NBE

UMT = *Undervisningsmetod tyska* = Project for Investigating Methods of Teaching German

UME = *Undervisningsmetod engelska* = Project for Investigating Methods of Teaching English

Lgr 62 = *Läroplan för grundskolan* = Curriculum Plan for the Swedish Comprehensive School, published 1962

Lgy 65 = *Läroplan för gymnasiet* = Curriculum Plan for the Swedish Grammar School (Upper Stages), published 1965

———————

Chapter II

TEACHING METHODS AND THE LANGUAGE LEARNING CONTROVERSY

The language controversy that raged in Sweden particularly during 1969–70 concerned language teaching methods. It appeared that the Direct Method was being contrasted to something called the Insight Method (Ellegård in Ellegård & Lindell, 1970). As the discussion developed, however, it became obvious that the participants were distinguishing the following four ideal types of "methods":

1) an extreme Direct Method
2) a modified Direct Method
3) an Insight Method
4) a modified Grammar/Translation Method

Unfortunately, it also became clear that the contributors to the debate tended to use these words in different senses and that in fact no strict operational definitions had been given of any of these methods (Heurlin in Edwardsson, 1970). Further, the National Board of Education's representatives maintained that they were supporters of a Modified Direct Method which could well be the same as the Insight Method in their view (Hjelmström/Rudal/Slettengren in Edwardsson, 1970). In addition, there was a tendency among the participants in this discussion to assume that the same method of teaching should be applied at all levels in schools and all ages. A notable exception to this was Gjötterberg (in Edwardsson, 1970; see also Dunlop, 1970). The importance of making an age distinction became clear after the "round robin" signed by 2000 language teachers which was sent to the National Board of Education in 1970 and clearly was mainly directed towards *gymnasium* teaching (Edholm/Gjötterberg/Offerberg in Edwardsson, 1970).

NBE representatives had pointed out earlier, however, that the curriculum for *gymnasium* was at that moment under revision so that presumably, in their view, there was no cause for worry.

Little empirical evidence was adduced in this discussion although reference was made to the Pennsylvania Reports (Smith & Berger, 1968 and Smith & Baranyi, 1968) as well as to the UMT Project (Lindell, 1970). The empirical studies referred to were, however, criticised both for methods and conclusions (Carroll, 1969, Andersson in Ellegård & Lindell, 1970, Levin & Olsson, 1971). In a discussion where strong opinions are held but few definitions given, it might help to discuss firstly the historical developments of certain "methods" of language teaching; secondly to try and define what those taking part in the 1969–70 controversy *seem* to have meant by the methods they talked about; and thirdly to advance a model showing the component parts that actually are included in a teaching method.

Historical survey

What is the Direct Method?

According to Mackey (1965) the Phonetic Method (or Reform Method) as represented by Viëtor (1902) combined with the principles of Gouin (1894) gave rise to the Direct Method movement. This "method" was in re-action against the grammar/translation method as advocated by Plötz, which had been the dominating influence throughout the

nineteenth century. However, to quote Mackey: "The sort of teaching engendered by the Direct Method movement was at first quite disorganised . . . the principles of Viëtor and Gouin were oversimplified in practice. They were confused with the 'natural method' in which the language was to be learned the same way as a child learns his mother tongue . . . The need for system was at length admitted by the exponents of these techniques . . . As the principles of the Direct Method spread there was more and more compromise with them in order to meet the growing demands for measurable standards of accuracy. Vocabulary exercises and systematic grammar drills were added. At a more advanced level, translation was included. And at all levels certain standards of correctness were required. In practice each country made its own compromise with the Direct Method. In Germany .... the method was adapted to more traditional language teaching and combined into what was eventually called the 'electic' method . . . In France a similar compromise resulted in the 'methode active'." (Mackey, 1965 p. 145–147)

In Sweden as Thorén pointed out, by 1957 "the modified direct method" was by and large the accepted norm "even if one teacher's practice is quite close to the grammar method while another's is very much nearer to the Direct Method". (Thorén, 1957 p. 6; my translation)

The United States had up to the Second World War concentrated on the Reading Method – trying to achieve a limited reading knowledge of the second language. However, during and after the War the effect of Army language teaching programmes and a combination of behavioural principles with those of structural linguistics led to the acceptance of the principles expressed by Moulton:

"Teach the language, not about the language"
"Language is speech, not writing"
"Language is a set of habits"
"Languages are different" (Moulton, 1962, p. 86–89)

Since the 1960's, however, Chomsky's generative theory of language (Chomsky, 1957 and Chomsky, 1964) has cast doubt on these principles and a great deal of discussion has arisen because of this. Hence the controversy in Sweden. Before however considering that in detail let us note some definitions of the Direct Method.

The Direct Method

Mackey defines this as follows:

"Its main characteristics are:

1. The use of everyday structure and vocabulary
2. Grammar taught by situation
3. Use of many new items in the same lesson to make the language sound natural and to encourage normal conversation
4. Oral teaching of grammar and vocabulary
5. Concrete meanings through object lessons; abstract ones through the association of ideas
6. Grammar illustrated through visual presentation
7. Extensive listening and imitation until forms become automatic
8. Most of the work done in class; more class hours needed for this method
9. The first few weeks devoted to pronunciation
10. All reading matter presented orally." (Mackey, 1965, p. 151–152)

Mackey also later (op.cit. p. 156) mentions the aspect of the Direct Method that causes perhaps most controversy: the use of the target language exclusively as the medium of instruction. However, it is not clear from the above definition that grammar is to be

acquired inductively through the study of texts which was one of the hallmarks of Viëtor's Reform Method which became incorporated in the Direct Method.

Again one can compare the above with Lado's definition: "The central idea of the direct method is the association of words and sentences with their meaning through demonstration, dramatization, pointing etc . . . The direct method assumed that learning a foreign language is the same as learning the mother tongue, that is, that exposing the student directly to the language impresses it perfectly upon his mind . . . (The direct method is) an approach to the teaching of a foreign language characterized by emphasis on presenting words and sentences to the students in ways that will show their meaning without translation or grammatical analysis . . . There are many varieties of the direct method or many direct methods". (Lado, 1964, p. 5 and p. 215)

Much earlier, too, Palmer had defined the Direct Method as a "somewhat vague term loosely denoting a system of language teaching largely based on the doctrine that translation should be excluded in the greatest possible measure". (Palmer, 1917, p. 311)

The Modified Direct Method in Sweden

Since it is difficult to agree on an entirely acceptable definition of the Direct Method it follows that it must also be difficult to agree on how it is modified. However, as the modified direct method was accepted in Sweden by 1957 (see Thorén, 1957) we must assume that the Curriculum for *grundskolan* (Lgr 62) gave expression to what the Modified Direct Method was taken to mean in Sweden, at the time when that Curriculum was written. We therefore list (in the same way as Mackey, 1965) the components of method as defined in that curriculum. These components are here not listed in order of importance.

Grundskolan (the Swedish Comprehensive School)

1. English is a means of spoken contact between people. Therefore comprehension of both spoken and written English is important.
2. Pupils should be taught to speak the language in simple everyday situations.
3. To the greatest degree possible teaching should be conducted in English.
4. To start with teaching should be oral (i.e. without use of continuous text).
5. However, after some time the text should be the central means for the introduction and practice of material.
6. Pupils should learn a "central vocabulary" of words and phrases.
7. Pronunciation, rhythm and intonation should mainly be learned through imitation.
8. Rules of pronunciation through spelling should be pointed out but not learned, but used in practice.
9. Oral practice should be used for imprinting grammatical forms and structures, as well as words and phrases.
10. The aim of oral practices is that pupils finally should be able to express their thoughts and feelings spontaneously in English.
11. Grammar is to be taught not through unnecessary analysis and rules but through systematic practice. However, in certain cases a rule or explanation can be given. This should not be done, however, until the grammatical pattern has first been practised by means of several examples. The pupils then with the help of leading questions from the teacher should have the chance to apprehend the rule. This *inductive* approach is to train the pupil's ability to make linguistic observations.
12. Swedish can be used for grammatical explanations if clarity might suffer otherwise. Particularly in the upper levels of *grundskolan* a certain amount of oral translation from Swedish to English is not forbidden. Translation from Swedish to English should not be used in written exercises until pupils have attained enough competence

in English so as not to translate word for word. Then, however, written exercises in translation from English to Swedish and Swedish to English can be used.

13. Written exercises should complement oral instructions though the main emphasis in class should be on oral instruction.
14. Explanations of vocabulary can be given by means of:
demonstration, pictures, definitions, explanations through examples, and translation.
15. Linguistic analysis even in its simplest forms demands a considerable ability in abstract reasoning and therefore with certain pupils it is reasonable not to give linguistic analysis or to postpone this to a later level and instead use skills training only in teaching. (Lgr 62, p. 190–203; my translation)

It is obvious from the above fifteen points that how teaching is actually carried on will be a matter of interpretation. In reading the Language Controversy one notes an undercurrent that the interpretation given to these guidelines by the National Board of Education and by language consultants had been more rigid in the direction of minimum use of grammatical explanations and translation than these guidelines appear to suggest (Edwardsson, 1970, p. 20; Malmberg, 1971, p. 179). This view is also reflected in the argument about unilingual word lists or English-Swedish word lists (Löfgren, 1966; *Statens läroboksnämnd*, 1965; The National Board of Education Dnr 88/66 U, 1966; Peters, 1969). The then State Board for Text Book Scrutiny *(Statens Läroboksnämnd)* had said in a circular to publishers in 1965:

> ". . . word lists for every text book, in principle unilingual, are to be preferred. Translation, however, should be used for words which demand an unproportionately long definition in the foreign language . . ." (My translation)

This Board also pointed out that it is more difficult to use unilingual word lists at the Beginners' level and therefore that for the first three years of English there should be alphabetical English-Swedish word lists, although this would not forbid publishers from also giving, throughout a book, unilingual comments and word explanations.

Again, from the comments made during the Language Controversy it appears that this directive gave many teachers and producers of text books the impression that *only* unilingual word lists should be used. It was also stated that the only relevant thing as far as teaching is concerned is how the Curriculum Plan is interpreted by teachers in the field (Ellegård in Edwardsson, 1970, p. 35). It is therefore one of the aims of this study to see how at the time of the IEA investigation in 1971 the teaching of English was carried out in the higher grades of *grundskolan,* in *fackskolan* and in *gymnasium* in the perception of teachers in those schools and to see if the methods used could be characterised as leaning to an extreme direct method or not. Reference has not been made in detail to the new Curriculum Plan for *grundskolan* (Lgr 69) as this was only relevant for one year of instruction for half of Population II. However, before reporting the results of the various questionnaires that were administered it would perhaps be helpful to give a brief outline of the earlier history of the "language debate" in Sweden.

As has been mentioned already, by 1957 (Thorén, 1957) there had been an acceptance of the idea of a Modified Direct Method but no generally agreed definition of it. The discussion that took place therefore in *Pedagogisk Debatt* during 1959 and 1960 showed a great deal of disagreement about language teaching methods. It can be said that Svante Hjelmström's article (1959) *Ut med översättningen*: (Down with Translation), started the discussion which continued throughout 1959 and 1960 (Gjötterberg, 1959a. and b.; Kruckenberg, 1959; Bergström, 1960; Wallström, 1960; Hjelmström, 1959 and 1960). At the same time there was a discussion about *Språkanalys och språkriktighet* (Language Analysis and Correctness in Language) in the pages of *Pedagogisk Debatt* (Torneld, 1959; Körner, 1959; Hyldegaard-Jensen, 1959) and further articles about examinations, tests and marks (Forssblad, 1959; Lengmark, 1960; Ljung, 1959). English had become a

compulsory subject in Swedish primary education in 1956 and the problems of foreign language teaching in almost undifferentiated primary school classes engaged the attention of many. Per-Olof Hensjö's "Build Up Their English" (1959) was intended as a manual for teachers in Grades 5 and 6 (those grades where primary school pupils at that time began their English studies). What Hensjö wrote in 1959 is largely reflected in the Curriculum Plan for the Swedish Primary School (Lgr 62). We shall return to the points presented in detail later, but it is important to remember now that the discussion about language teaching represented then, and still represents now, a cleavage between the old grammar school (both junior and senior stages i.e. *realskolan* and *gymnasium*) and the new system of the Swedish Comprehensive School with compulsory training in English for all. This cleavage between general primary education and more specialised academic education goes back to the very beginnings of general primary education for all in the nineteenth century (Marklund, 1966). It reflects the struggle between academic depth and general education breadth and therefore the arguments about methods in language teaching are often in fact less arguments about methods than about opposing philosophies of education. In philosophical terms many of the statements made in the discussion over the years have been "attitude statements" (Wilson, 1960).

The position, however, as defined by those who took part in the discussion about language teaching (including that of the mother tongue) in *Pedagogisk Debatt* Nos. 7 and 8, 1959/60 can be, somewhat schematically, summarised as follows:

a) the proponents of the "pure" Direct Method wished to do away with:
   (i) translation in all forms except as a "prompt voice" at the Beginners' stage. (Hjelmström, 1960)
   (ii) complicated theoretical grammar and its nomenclature. (Torneld, 1959)
   (iii) comparisons between Swedish and English structures. (Hjelmström, 1960)
b) the opponents of a "pure" Direct Method wished to retain translation as a check on understanding on the pupils' part (Kruckenberg, 1959) and as a help for extensive reading and passive understanding (Gjötterberg, 1959)
c) most of the participants seemed to be against the grammatical and stylistic terminology in use at that time and which was based on nineteenth century grammars (Körner, 1959)

That such a discussion took place shows that at the time although the Modified Direct Method was accepted, the degree of emphasis given to translation and theoretical grammar was still large in the more academically orientated schools. Hensjö's "Build Up Their English" (1959) also indicates, by his description of what was needed in primary schools, what by contrast was done before. The following excerpts, here translated, give Hensjö's main observations on method:

1) a method should be established which as far as possible should approach the process by which children have learned and continually are learning their own language (p. 3)
2) the more undifferentatiated the pupils, the more Beginners' teaching of a foreign language should build on pure imitation and the more cautions one should be about theorising (p. 2–3)
3) . . . the Direct Method . . . which from the beginning works with questions and answers in the foreign language (p. 3)
4) in a class with pupils of differing abilities . . . the only practical possibility is to deal with the foreign language as directly as possible, and from the beginning build up associations between the object and the foreign word . . . without too many explanations and with the use of a minimum of grammatical terminology (p. 3)
5) language is in the first place sound and melody – not letters and combinations of letters, syllables and graphemes. Language in its written or printed form is something secondary (p. 5)

6) If we allow English to live and function as a medium for oral contact between teachers and pupils and between the pupils themselves, then we shall also create a living interest (p. 5)
7) the pupils should first learn a little of the language . . . When they have learned a little of the language . . . then (and not till then) will it be worthwhile talking about the language. Only then will grammatical rules and explanations be concrete and understandable for them (p. 6)
8) This does not mean that pupils should not learn terms like: the Indefinite Article, the Definite Article, Numerals etc. But it is immensely important that one should clearly understand that terminology in itself does not always explain and define but often instead is a burden for the pupils and makes the matter, if possible, even more difficult to understand (p. 7)
9) Terminology is needed to a certain degree, especially for more advanced language studies . . . but for all language teaching the rule is:
first the linguistic expression, then further expressions of the same type then lastly the rule to imprint the common principle for the category of expression in question . . . We will not denigrate grammar and despise it, but we shall keep in its proper place. We shall regard it as an aid, not an end in itself (p. 7)
10) To start the first lesson without using a word of the native language and by demonstrating objects and saying what they are called in English, can have a psychological effect which is exactly the opposite of the one intended (p. 9)
11) (At the Second Lesson, talking to the pupils:) "You do not need to learn how to write phonetic script. You only need to learn how to read phonetic script and this you must learn thoroughly" (p. 13)
12) A "pure" form of Direct Method teaching not using a book for two or three months (or even a term), is very arduous work. The majority of teachers, in fact, need the support given by the teaching sequence in a text book . . . Let us use the text book as a basis, but not be too bound by it
13) Use the question technique described in Harold Palmer's book: The Teaching of Oral English (p. 15)
14) (talking about teaching the Definite Article) The question is, if it isn't wisest to begin by making a comparison of English and Swedish but not so that the emphasis is put on terminology . . . We shall compare Swedish and English without too much theorising; we shall say that in Swedish we sometimes say "hund*en*". The same thing is expressed in English by putting the word "the" before "dog": "the dog" (p. 35)
15) Sooner or later a comparison between Swedish and English will be necessary in order to explain the principles of Word Order . . . but the question is when this theoretical explanation shall be given. Presumably, it would be best to wait until the pupils have read and heard and themselves have said things like: In Sweden we speak Swedish . . . Here as always, it is not sufficient to give a comparison with Swedish and a learning by heart of the rule:
English uses subject – verb order usually (p. 66)
16) (Talking about Questions and Negatives with "Do") In order to explain the difference we must introduce the term: auxiliary verb. There is no need to analyse this concept; the expression "auxiliary verb" is quite simply a label given to certain verbs (p. 79)

It is clear from what has been quoted above that Hensjö's aim is to use grammar not as a theoretical study *per se* but as an aid. He also does not ban the use of Swedish or of comparisons with Swedish but uses both of these for practical purposes only and intends English lessons to be conducted in English, although Swedish can be introduced for explanatory purposes. He stresses however that translation as an exercise needs special training and he notes that translation plays an important part in the examination system. (Note that this refers to the system in 1959.) His comments on earlier methods of

teaching (which he does not think are applicable to general compulsory schooling) are among others as follows (my translation):

> "... the grammar/translation method is less demanding on the teacher, for the average teacher, than the Direct Method... It is easier and more comfortable to talk about the language than to speak the language. This results in detailed grammatical explanations, comparisons and examples from Swedish grammar, tests, not only of English, but of knowledge of grammatical terminology, and parsing and analysis. Then if one is fortunate, after a thorough commentary and translation, a short Speech Practice consisting of five or six questions at the end of the lesson" (op.cit., p. 4).

Then on p. 140 he describes the contrast of his teaching strategy with what had obtained previously:

> "(... formerly) when Speech Practice during a lesson consisted only of approximately ten questions on the text read for homework while the rest of the lesson was made up of test questions on grammatical examples, underlining words and phrases in the text, and test questions on those underlined words and phrases; in other words when the greater part of the lesson was conducted in Swedish."

To show how much has changed in Sweden as regards English teaching since Hensjö wrote this, it is illuminating to note that some of the Lecturers in Method at Training Colleges now find it difficult to define the Grammar/Translation Method in those terms (cf. Appendix A).

However, it must also be pointed out that it is clear that Hensjö focuses mainly on the early stages of language learning and not on the secondary school level. As has also been already mentioned, the majority of Hensjö's principles are to be found in the Curriculum Plan for the Swedish Comprehensive School (Lgr 1962). His reference, too, to Palmer is interesting as Palmer had in fact already stated that for the explanation of meaning:

> "No hard and fast rule can be adopted as to the mode of giving the meaning of units; each in its turn may be superior to the others" (Palmer, 1917, p. 100)

By "mode", Palmer means here the four ways of explaining meaning that he gives in his chapter on "The Principles of Linguistic Pedagogy":

Mode A: Material Association
Mode B: Translation
Mode C: Definition
Mode D: Context

Palmer goes on to say:

> "The general principle, then, may stand: During the early stages use Modes A and B, and avoid C and D; during the later stages use whichever of the four modes happens to be the most convenient.
> It must be perfectly understood, of course, that in order that the translation may be efficacious we must associate the foreign word with the true native equivalent word or definition not with an imaginary or merely traditional one." (Palmer, op.cit., p. 101.)

It is difficult in fact to avoid the conclusion that the 1969–70 discussion in Sweden about language teaching was to a degree caused by the decision of the State Board for Text Book Scrutiny (1965) not to recommend English-Swedish word lists and also by the fact that teachers believed that only unilingual grammars were to be used in schools.

Undoubtedly, too, one of the causes of friction had been that when pupils moved from *grundskolan* to the *gymnasium* two systems of teaching, which are not perfectly adapted to each other, conflicted. The universities in their turn when they received pupils

from the *gymnasium* then complained that their students were not sufficiently well-prepared linguistically.

At this point therefore it would help to analyse the complaints made about English language teaching, under three headings, by looking at the problems of three consecutive stages of the educational system:

A) At the Primary School level (i.e. the Swedish Comprehensive School): *grundskolan*
B) At the Secondary School level (i.e. the three year "Grammar School Upper Section"): *gymnasium*
C) At the University level.

A considerable part of the source material for the first two of these stages has been collected by Edwardsson (1970) and Ellegård & Lindell (1970).

A) *Grundskolan*

(i) Discipline and attentiveness

The complaint made about the Swedish Comprehensive School was that its pupils were not made able to make the jump to the *gymnasium* standard. Further, some considered that the *gymnasium* Curriculum Plan (Lgy 1965) was too literary and had unrealistically high aims if one considered the real standard of pupils coming from the Comprehensive School ("2000 Language Teachers' Protest", Edwardsson, 1970, p. 80–81). The teachers (in their Points 8 and 9) expressed a wish for the return of translation both in teaching and testing. This seemed to reflect the belief that somehow translation is a more exact measure of language knowledge than other tests. This is an illustration of the confusion of method and attitude that has bedevilled the argument about language teaching (Dunlop, 1971b). Norinder (1971) reported the following findings from a longitudinal study of school children: a "continuing depreciation of the ability to concentrate among children now growing up" and a decrease in the powers of "attentiveness, concentration and perseverance" among pupils who disturb the calm of the classroom atmosphere. According to Norinder by the time Grade 6 is reached:

> "there is an average of one-quarter (25 %) of the boys, but still not more than 10 % of the girls, who disturb lessons and group-work with unnecessary chatter or unsuitable behaviour . . . the facts do not confirm that the intellectually 'underdeveloped' are a majority in the group of disturbers . . . It appears, however, as if the non-disturbing pupils belong to the most neglected group at present. Too many of these are bored, mainly for the reason that they do not have sufficient opportunity to study effectively at school . . . for these pupils the schools should make much more provision so that they can study at school according to the rate and capacity given them by nature . . . The other group – the disturbing one – in many cases need still more training, especially in attentiveness concentration and perseverance." (Norinder, op.cit., p. 19–20)

"Attentiveness, concentration and perseverance" are attitudes that should be trained by any method of language teaching, but there seems to be a feeling that the Direct Method does not demand hard work and that the pupils "play their way" to knowledge. Hensjö shows himself to be aware of this criticism as early as 1959. Hence the "attitude-statement" (in Wilson's meaning) that translation is necessary; translation and grammar being then equated with exact study and disciplined work with the implication that Direct Method teaching is slack and inexact.

(ii) Marking Systems

At the same time as discipline problems were increasing in the Comprehensive School the argument about School Marks *(betyg)* and Marking Systems *(betygsättning)* continued. Who to fail and how many to fail has always been a discussion dear to the Swedish academic heart and reference has already been made to the discussion in *Pedagogisk Debatt* in 1959. (See also *Aktuellt från Skolöverstyrelsen*, 1954). This Bulletin from the NBE was a special issue addressed to modern language teachers and included a chapter on the marking of examinations using a 7-point scale.

The Board posed the question if it was not time to "rationalise the marking of examination papers in modern languages". (op.cit., p. 342. My translation)

The system later adopted in both *grundskolan* and *gymnasium* for term or year marks was based on the normal curve of distribution i.e. the Norm Referenced Standard*(relativbetygskalan)* using a five point scale. On the basis of standardised tests, each teacher would calculate how many pupils in his class were to be awarded Mark 5, Mark 4 etc. Then through a process of continuous evaluation the teacher would decide which of the pupils in the class would be awarded what level of mark. The norms as given in Lgr 62 and Lgy 65 were regarded by the National Board of Education as norms for the whole country and not as norms per class as these norms followed the normal curve. In practice, however, how a teacher distributed the marks for an individual class which did *not* co-incide with this distribution seems (subjectively) to have varied from school district to school district. Moreover, from correspondence in the newspapers it appeared that parents, at least, had received the idea that the "normal" distribution applied to *all* individual classes. It was a fixed system which no amount of work by the pupils could alter. Therefore if someone was moved from a class (and had only Mark 1) in order to keep to the normal curve someone else would be moved from the Mark 2 classification down to the Mark 1 grade. That this was so was strenuously refuted by the National Board of Education (see Lgy 65, p. 61) but it is difficult to see how parents and teachers could avoid *in practice* the impression that everything was subordinated to the normal distribution (see e.g. Blom, 1969; Council of Europe, 1970, p. 21–22).

The criticism levelled against Norm Referenced tests in Sweden has recently resulted in an NBE proposal to do away with Norm Referenced Tests and substitute Criterion Referenced Tests where the pupils are tested against the subject rather than against each other (Skolöverstyrelsen, 1973).

The uneasiness of language teachers, therefore, in Sweden was an uneasiness caused, in part, by a system of marking of which they did not approve and partly by the gap between the objectives as expressed in the Curriculum and what they felt the pupils could achieve. The striking gap was between objectives set in the Curriculum Plan for *grundskolan* for English and those stated for *gymnasium*. No specific points were mentioned in the latter for the study of grammar or vocabulary or for Life and Institutions. The emphasis was on describing the type of text to be read. Here it is the second grade in *gymnasium* that is of interest. The following is quoted from the Curriculum Plan for *Gymnasium* (Lgy 65, p. 126, my translation):

B) The Secondary School (i.e. the Swedish *gymnasium*)

Grade 2 (i.e. second year):

> "Pronunciation; special reading and intonation practices.
> Listening comprehension and speech practices: summary re-telling; short lectures; conversation.

Reading of texts (intensively, extensively and cursively): modern English and American imaginative literature; an act or some excerpts from a play by Shakespeare; some representative poems from the Romantic Revival to the Present Day; some examples of older prose, for example Dickens, and of essays; modern non-fiction prose texts of an average level of difficulty, including extracts from newspapers, which should in part be connected with other subjects according to the track being followed. Examples can be taken from the literature of other English-speaking countries besides Great Britain and the United States. In connection with imaginative literature a short literary history background should be given. The amount of text to be read should be approximately 200 pages. Style, synonyms, phraseology, word building and philology should also be mentioned.
There should be written exercises including summaries, letter writing, essay writing and practical writing.
Grammatical patterns should be practised in connection with the text being read and an overview should be given.
Life and Institutions should be dealt with in connection with the text being read."

General comments on language teaching are as follows (my translation):

"General aims: to develop the ability to understand the language in speech and writing;
to develop and re-inforce skills in speaking, reading and writing the language and to a certain degree knowledge about the culture and life of the countries where the foreign language is native to its speakers"

It is also stressed that the general attitude to studying a language as expressed in the Curriculum Plan for *grundskolan* applies in all important points to studying a language at the *gymnasium* level.
It will be noted that in fact the emphasis in *gymnasium* moves away from the spoken language towards the written language, especially for reading purposes, while at the same time the number of hours devoted to English diminishes.
The differences in complexity between the grammar of spoken English and that of written English (Vygotsky, 1962; Abercrombie, 1965; Gordon, 1966; Gjötterberg, 1969; Quirk & Greenbaum, 1973) together with the increase in vocabulary knowledge necessary to read Dickens and Shakespeare (after only one year's extra study after *grundskolan*) must be a large contributory factor towards the uneasiness at the gap between *grundskolan* and *gymnasium* expressed by teachers in *gymnasium* in 1969–70 (Edwardsson, 1970; Ellegård & Lindell, 1970).

C) The Universities

Perhaps one should point out first that complaints about lower standards came *from* the universities and were not directed at them, largely because most reports came from the universities themselves. For example, the University of Gothenburg reported:

"(university) students (of English) are performing at such a low level that even the standards officially given for the elementary schools are not being attained. This involves the use of the most elementary and common grammatical constructions in both speech and writing, elementary vocabulary and in many cases the pronunciation of common words . . . The sad truth is that by the time they reach their tenth year (namely, university), many of today's students are still at the elementary stage in the respects mentioned above." (Marton, 1970, p. 20)

Earlier, Stockholm University (Jalling, 1969) had reported that 90 % of the students tested in the English Department did not use normal English weak forms in speech,

and the report also suggested there were serious defects in students' speech in many other respects. Lund University wrote to the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities in August 1970 saying that:

> ". . . the language departments see themselves forced to pass students who have a too unacceptably low ability in language skills to be accepted as language teachers in schools . . . elementary errors in language correctness show an alarmingly high frequency." (My translation)

The reason given for this was too low a standard of knowledge at the *gymnasium* level combined with a method in secondary schools which did not pay enough attention to grammar and exactitude (Vitestam and Olsson in Edwardsson, 1970, p. 109).

A conference was arranged in February 1971 by the National Board of Education and the Chancellor of the Swedish Universities to which representatives of schools and universities were invited to discuss the situation in the teaching of modern languages. It was pointed out there by the Head of the National Board of Education that the numbers of students in their first year studying modern languages at Swedish universities had risen from 700 in 1954, to 3,300 in 1968:

> "In other words, if 20 % of today's students have attained a good standard of knowledge, that is as great a total in numbers as the whole student population studying modern languages 14 years ago" (My translation: Skolöverstyrelsen, 1971)

Marton, in fact, in his own report on the Gothenburg University English Department gave figures supporting this view:

> ". . . only 17 % of the weakest quarter of the students at entrance (as measured by their initial test) passed the two-mark level in language proficiency after one year, whereas the whole of the best quarter of the students passed this level before even starting their course of studies in Autumn Term (sic) of 1967." (Marton, 1970, p. 9)

It should be noted that the Swedish university year consists of two terms and that the "two-mark level" (later changed to 40 "points") denotes the pass mark in the final degree examination in English for those students who are intending to become teachers.

The reference to future teachers is not accidental, as one of the problems facing Swedish universities, caused partly by the expansion in the numbers studying languages, is that whereas in the past it was accepted that language graduates would become teachers, by 1971 less than a third of those who applied for entrance to Teacher Training College were admitted. In fact, in the autumn of 1971 those offering English as part of their qualifications numbered 1402; of those 260 were accepted: a percentage of acceptance of less than 18 %. (Skolvärlden, 1971, p. 15)

In spite of the fact, however, that the expansion in the number of language students was accompanied by a drop in the percentage who would be allowed to become teachers, the universities at first seemed slow to appreciate the reality that the majority of their language graduates would not be able to take up their traditional employment.

Jalling says (my translation):

> "As however the university is one of the school system's most important 'customers' and at the same time in modern languages the school system is one of the university's most important 'customers' . . ." (Jalling, 1969, p. 19)

Marton talks about "the requirements to be set for prospective English teachers (the goal of the majority of students of English at the university, but one that, since the teacher shortage of a few years ago disappeared, can only be attained by a minority of them)" (Marton, 1970, p. 17).

At the Round Table Conference (1971) mentioned above Professor Korlén stated that "Teacher training is still the central thing from the point of view of the universities" (p. 114), and Edwardsson stated at the same conference "One of the main aims of the universities' language departments is to give future teachers an adequate training in their subjects" (p. 28, my translation, as is the quotation from Professor Korlén). However, at the same time Edwardsson asked if it would not be reasonable to keep to the same proportions for those studying languages (as future teachers) and the number that could be accepted by Teacher Training Colleges, and also stated the case for other types of university course for those who would not later become teachers. The Chancellor of the Swedish Universities concluded that:

> "Obviously the problem concerns the very large and growing group who are not going to become teachers. It is they who must be offered an alternative." (Skolöverstyrelsen, 1971, p. 155; my translation)

The universities were not only troubled about what type of course to offer an expanding number of students at the end of the '60's, they also had to contend with the reformed system for university education (known first as UKAS then as PUKAS). This system was predicated on a through-put of students taking their final examination in a subject (the 40 "point" level) after two terms study. The pass rate apparently expected by the authorities was to be in the region of 67 %. (*Kungl. Maj:ts proposition* nr. 4 år 1969, p. 78)

If this is compared to Marton's figure of 25 % of students being capable of passing the final examination when they entered the university, a proportion of almost 67 % passing the final examination after only two terms university study would only be realistic if the entrance standard of the overwhelming majority of students was high. On the contrary, however, the evidence points to a very wide spread in the ability and knowledge of students on leaving school. (Marton, 1968; Söderlind, 1969; Björneberg as reported by Ellegård at the Round Table Conference, 1971). This raises the question of "how many are brought how far? " (Husén, 1966, p. 22, and Husén, 1972, p. 127) or "retentivity" (Postlethwaite, 1967). This question will be discussed later in the chapter dealing with the results of the IEA cognitive tests. It is sufficient for the moment to say that with the large expansion in the university population referred to above, it was unreasonable to expect that two-thirds of that population should achieve a pass mark in their final English examination within such a short period of study as two terms (von Proschwitz, 1973).

There is no indication, however, either that the best university students of English nowadays achieve a worse result than the best students of twenty years ago. Indeed, there are indications that students during the late Sixties were asked to achieve more (at least at Stockholm University) than those of previous generations: if not in language proficiency then in the "factual-cultural" subjects which played such a large part in their examination. For example, in comparison with twenty years ago, those studying English had these additional theoretical subjects:

> General phonetics; general linguistics; the history of American literature in the 19th and 20th centuries; American life and institutions.

Further, because of the introduction of multiple-choice questions and computer marking the number of questions to be answered by students in theoretical subject examinations increased greatly: from an average of 20, twenty years ago, to approximately 500 in 1970. (*Exempel på skriftliga prov Läsåret 1970/71*, 1970).

Further, in language proficiency in 1970 students were tested orally in Pronunciation and aurally in Listening Comprehension, and in written work were given a 250 question multiple-choice test (made up of 200 questions on grammar and structure and 50 questions on recognition of vocabulary) as well as an Essay and a short translation. This written work is to be compared with one long translation and a viva twenty years ago.

The discussion in the press in 1969/70 was, however, exclusively concerned with the standard of language proficiency achieved by pupils at school and at university and from the short review above can be seen to have revolved around:

the standard of English proficiency achieved;
the merits and demerits of the Direct Method and the Modified Direct Method (and what they mean);
the use (or non-use) of Swedish in teaching English;
methods of teaching grammar.

With this in mind, it seemed relevant to inquire:

(a) how those who lecture at Training Colleges would define the Direct Method and other teaching methods
(b) what teachers in schools actually believe are the methods they themselves use
(c) what standard school pupils have achieved

The first two of these points will be dealt with in Chapters III and IV and the third point is taken up in Chapters VI and VII which deal with the results of the IEA cognitive tests and the Special Listening Comprehension test.

Chapter III

ATTEMPTS TO ASSESS AN EXPERT DEFINITION OF TEACHING METHODS

In order to see if there was a consensus about the definition of terms like the Direct Method, it was decided to send a questionnaire to lecturers in methods of teaching English at the following Teacher Training Colleges: Gothenburg, Linköping, Malmö, Stockholm, Uppsala and Umeå.

Questionnaires were also distributed, through the NBE, to school inspectors and language consultants. As the list of names of lecturers in method was that on the NBE's List of Lecturers of 30th November 1972 (SÖ L3:3) it was felt that the results of the questionnaire would give an indication as to whether or not there was a consensus of opinion as regards definitions of teaching methods among those responsible for teaching future teachers about methods of teaching English. It was the opinion of this author that, judging from the language learning controversy, there would be considerable discrepancies of opinion concerning method among lecturers in method and consultants. It was one aim of the questionnaire, however, to ascertain if any consensus could be established as to method even if individual experts differed on a number of points. By canvassing a fairly large number of experts one could see on which points consensus might be established and then compare that consensus with other definitions of teaching method.

69 questionnaires were sent out to cover the whole designated expert population. From the total of 29 replies there were 16 complete questionnaires that could be used as the basis for an analysis. It is stressed again therefore, that this was an attempt to ascertain if a fairly large group of experts could be said to be in agreement about definitions of teaching methods or not. If they were not in agreement, then an attempt would be made to investigate, on the basis of the data, the points on which it might be possible for experts in method to arrive at consensus.

The instructions given with the questionnaire are shown in Appendix A in the form of the letter that accompanied the questionnaire itself. This was sent out at the beginning of February 1973 and all the answers that were received had arrived by 10th March. The geographical spread of answers was re-assuring as it meant that no one Training College predominated unduly. It should be stressed, however, that the replies to the questionnaire were anonymous and that particular answers cannot be linked to particular lecturers. The spread of replies was as follows:

Gothenburg: 5 Malmö: 8 Stockholm: 10
Umeå: 4 Uppsala: 2

It will be noted that although the letter was sent in English the questionnaire itself was in Swedish and consisted of 45 items selected from the two IEA Teacher Questionnaires (TQ 5 and TQ 7, see Lewis & Massad, 1975), and also from the special National Board of Education Teacher Questionnaire administered to the same sample of schools at the time the IEA survey was carried out (Malmberg, 1975). The lecturers in method were therefore, in effect, being asked to give answers which could provide a basis for an operational definition of four different methods of teaching English in terms of the same items that teachers in schools had already answered. This it was hoped would enable the teachers' perception of what they did in teaching to be compared with an expert definition of what different methods consist of. This would then help to provide a more precise answer to the question raised in the language teaching controversy as to whether or not Swedish teachers of English used an extreme Direct Method for teaching English in

1971. The summed answers to the questionnaire by lecturers in method will be found in Appendix A. In Appendix B the same results are collated as dichotomies; that is to say the answers have been placed in two categories:

Favourable towards a statement (using the designation "often" or "often/most of the time" etc.)

Unfavourable towards a statement (using the designation "Seldom/Never" to "Sometimes"; or "Never/Sometimes")

It must be stressed that the results therefore reflect a pooling of opinion and do not represent any one expert's opinion of the various methods of teaching. As can be seen by examining the results in Appendix A, there is considerable disagreement between experts as to what constitutes a particular method. If this pilot investigation has done anything it has shown that it is extremely unfruitful to use words like "Direct Method" (undefined) since the experts have such diverging ways of defining it.

It should be noted that the results only show how this particular group of experts perceive teacher behaviour in English in relation to different methods. These have been categorised as follows:

LEDM = leaning to the extreme direct method
MDM = modified direct method
EC = eclectic (in the sense of taking different techniques from differing methods)
G/T = grammar/translation

In addition the following abbreviation is used:
NBE for the National Board of Education questionnaire

If the experts' perception of different approaches to teaching are tabulated they would appear as follows:

tvs = experts tend very strongly to say (i.e. about 90 % or more of experts consulted)

ts = experts tend strongly to say (i.e. about 2/3rds to 90 % experts consulted)

t = experts tend to say (i.e. about 50 % to 2/3rds of experts consulted)

50/50 = experts are split almost equally for and against saying this.

The addition of N after a symbol means that experts think that this particular aspect of teaching is NOT used in that method e.g. tvsN in the section "use of text books" means that the experts tend very strongly to think that text books would *not* be used with this approach.

The results of the tabulation described above appear in Table III:1.

Table III:1 Definition of LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T According to Sample of Experts

	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
A)				
use text books	tsN	tvs	ts	ts
use printed drill material	tsN	tvs	ts	ts
give lectures (except occasionally)	tvsN	tvsN	tvsN	tsN
use students' mother tongue (except occasionally)	tvsN	tsN– tvsN	tsN	ts– tvs
use a language laboratory often	tsN	tsN	tsN	tvsN
B)				
use audio-visual materials (TV, films, radio etc.) often	ts	t	tN	tvsN
use the blackboard often	tvs	ts	tvs	tvs
use "props" (i.e. various real objects)	ts	ts	tN	tvsN
use a tape recorder (whole class)	tvs	tvs	tvs	tN
C) At the Beginners Level:				
give most emphasis to Listening Comprehension	ts	ts	ts	
give 2nd emphasis to Speaking Fluency	ts	t	t	See
give 3rd emphasis to Correct pronunciation	t	t	t ?	Note 2
give 4th emphasis to Reading Comprehension	ts	ts	t	below
give 5th emphasis to Ability to Write in English	tvs	tvs	tvs	
D)				
give greater emphasis to fluency rather than correct pronunciation	t			
give equal emphasis to fluency and correct pronunciation		ts	tvs	
give greater emphasis to correct pronunciation rather than fluency				t
spoken form of English learned before the written forms (reading and writing) are presented	tvs	t		
spoken forms are presented generally before the corresponding written forms but the spoken and written forms of the language are learned together			ts	See Note 3 below
teach the pronunciation of correct English sounds by:				
(i) making the pupils listen carefully and imitate	ts	ts	ts	
(ii) giving practice in imitation, supplemented with explanations about how the sounds are made				ts
E) teach grammar:				
(i) through students' imitation of the teacher *in same way as students learn their native language*	tvs			
(ii) by using a combination of inductive and deductive methods; English being learned by imitation and practice after which grammar rules are explained to help in forming correct speech		tvs	tvs	
(iii) through the rules presented formally and then applied in translation				ts

NOTE: 1) The fact that Listening Comprehension is given as the first aim at the Beginners Level for LEDM, MDM and EC appears to be contradicted by the fact that for all these methods the experts would give a greater proportion of time in class to Speaking rather than Listening (See Table III:3 *infra*).

2) The experts are notably divided on the question of emphasis for Reading Comprehension etc., at the Beginners Level according to the G/T method and the following description should therefore be treated with extreme caution especially as in the time devoted to practice of various skills in class using the G/T approach, the experts give more time to Writing than they do to Reading and Listening (See Table III:3 *infra*). With these provisos in mind the nearest consensus for emphasis on skills at the Beginners Level using the G/T method is:

give most emphasis to:	Reading Comprehension
give 2nd emphasis to:	Correct Pronunciation
give 3rd emphasis to:	Listening Comprehension
give 4th emphasis to:	Ability to Write English
give 5th emphasis to:	Speaking Fluency

3) As regards the order of presentation of spoken and written forms of the language the experts are notably divided, as far as the G/T method is concerned, as follows:

spoken forms presented generally before the corresponding written forms but the spoken and written forms of the language learned together:	6
written forms presented generally before the corresponding spoken forms, but the spoken and written forms of the language learned together:	5
reading and writing learned before speaking and understanding:	4

(1 expert did not reply)

The experts' opinion about the teaching of grammar and the use of native language was further explored in the items taken from the NBE questionnaire. This pooling of expert opinion is reflected in Table III:2.

Table III:2 Grammar Teaching and Use of Mother Tongue in LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T

	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
A) *Grammar Teaching*				
(i) Rules in connection with grammar practice: give rules with pattern practices	tvsN	50/50	tvs	ts
(ii) give a rule as a summing up/conclusion in pattern practices	tsN	tvs	tvs	tsN
(iii) use the method "memorisation of grammatical examples"	tsN	50/50	50/50	t
(iv) use the method of "learning definite rules" to teach grammar	tvsN	tsN	50/50	tvs
(v) teach grammar by means of a systematic study of the grammar book	tvsN	tvsN	50/50	tvs
(vi) teach grammar in connection with the text being studied	50/50	ts	tvs	50/50
B) *Use of mother tongue*				
(i) to explain grammar:				
use English alone	ts	50/50	tsN	tvsN
use Swedish alone	tvsN	tsN	50/50	tvs
use a combination of English and Swedish	tsN	t	tvs	tsN
(ii) to explain new vocabulary:				
use Swedish alone	tvsN	tsN	50/50	tvs
use English alone	tvs	t	tsN	tvsN
use an English explanation in combination with a Swedish translation	tvsN	ts	ts	tvsN

Lastly, before describing the differences between these four methods in the experts' perception, we should note the differences in teaching time allotted to the four skills in these four methods according to the experts, as shown in Table III:3.

Table III:3 Classroom Time Given to the Four Skills in LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T

NOTE: Adjusted percentages	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	Source
Reading (both extensive and reading aloud)	13 %	12 %	12 %	12 %	NBE Item 3a
Writing (both guided writing practice and free writing)	15 %	15 %	16 %	16 %	
Listening (listening comprehension: longer passages)	15 %	13 %	11 %	4 %	
Speaking (guided speech practice of the pattern practice type AND non-guided speech practice and conversation AND pronunciation practice, either chorally or individually)	45 %	36 %	31 %	11 %	
TOTAL	88 %	76 %	70 %	43 %	
Vocabulary (study)	6 %	8 %	7 %	10 %	
Grammar (study)	5 %	9 %	11 %	18 %	
Translation (both into and from English)	1 %	6 %	12 %	30 %	
TOTAL	12 %	23 %	30 %	58 %	
GRAND TOTAL	100 %	99 %	100 %	101 %	

Conclusion I

To sum up, in this pilot survey of expert opinion the distinguishing features of the Leaning to the Extreme Direct Method approach are:

use of English for teaching and non-use of mother tongue;
non-use of rules in grammar teaching;
use of AV materials (TV, films, radio and tapes); non-use of language laboratories;
use of blackboard, pictures and props;
non-use of text books and printed drill material;
listening and speaking given priority over reading and writing;
both grammar and pronunciation taught by imitation;
fluency more important than correct pronunciation;
non-use of translation.

If one compares this list with the description given by Mackey (1965) it will be seen that the pooled opinion of Swedish experts is more in line with what Mackey describes as the earlier approaches used in the Direct Method. This Swedish "consensus" therefore does describe a more extreme type of Direct Method and it also contains all the elements mentioned in Lado's (1964) definition.

It is also interesting to compare this sample of expert opinion with the definition of the Direct Method given by Malmberg: (the Direct Method) "refers to the fact that the linguistic sign is bound directly to the thing referred to (the referent) and that it is learned and understood through its context and not through translation into the mother tongue. In the same way, grammatical categories and their functions are understood and learned through examples, patterns and models, not through explicitly formulated rules. The 'direct' in the method lies in this principle and therefore has the following consequences:

1. all translation is forbidden (even in word lists)
2. all commentaries, whether oral or written, to do with language events or non-language events are given in the target language
3. comprehension is tested through definitions and paraphrases (re-telling the contents etc.)
4. all conversation in the classroom or in the teaching situation is carried on in the target language
5. grammar is learned by the help of patterns and imitation of patterns
6. imitation plays a decisive role and the command and mastery of patterns is achieved through repetition of pattern drills"

(Malmberg, 1971, p. 80. My translation)

This corresponds well with the perception of the sample of experts and the pooling of their opinions regarding the Leaning to the Extreme Direct Method approach. It is necessary, however, to contrast this with the opinion of the sample of experts as regards the three other methods investigated viz,

MDM modified direct method;
EC eclectic;
G/T grammar/translation.

The conclusions regarding the experts' answers are given below:

Conclusion II

The distinguishing marks of the Modified Direct Method are:

use of both English and Swedish in the teaching of English although there is considerable ambiguity about how often Swedish would be used;
use of "rules" in grammar teaching (but not "grammar book" rules) but again ambivalence about how this is expressed;
use of AV materials (TV, films, radio and tapes); non-use of language laboratories;
use of blackboard, pictures and props;
use of text books and printed drill material;
listening and speaking given priority over reading and writing;
pronunciation taught by imitation; grammar through both imitation and "rules";
fluency and correct pronunciation equally important;
translation used to a small degree.

The following differences between LEDM and MDM can be noted:

(a) Whereas LEDM bars the use of Swedish, MDM does not although how much Swedish is used in MDM is a matter for conjecture
(b) LEDM bars the use of rules; MDM will give "rules" but not "grammar book" rules
(c) Whereas LEDM would not use text books and printed drill material, MDM does
(d) LEDM gives priority to fluency as compared to correct pronunciation whereas MDM gives equal importance to both
(e) LEDM bars translation almost completely whereas MDM will allow a little

Conclusion III

The distinguishing marks of the Eclectic Method are:

use of both English and Swedish in the teaching of English;
use of rules in grammar teaching (but not "grammar book rules" although there is considerable ambiguity about this latter);
non-use of audio-visual materials except for use of tape recorder but non-use of language laboratories;
use of blackboard but not of pictures and "props";

use of text books and printed drill material;
listening and speaking given priority over reading and writing;
pronunciation taught by imitation; grammar through both imitation and "rules";
translation used to a degree (i.e. greater degree than in MDM).

The differences between EC and MDM are mainly ones of emphasis but in addition certain more strongly marked differences appear:

(a) EC tends not to use TV, films and radio whereas MDM does
(b) EC teaches written and spoken forms together whereas MDM prefers to teach the spoken forms before the written ones are learned
(c) EC tends to use "rules" in teaching more than MDM does although there is no unanimity among the experts about this
(d) EC tends to use a combination of English and Swedish for explanations whereas MDM tends more towards the use of English for explanations.

Conclusion IV

The distinguishing marks of the Grammar/Translation method are:

non-use of English for teaching but use of mother tongue;
use of rules in grammar teaching (and by this is meant "grammar book rules");
non-use of audio-visual materials (TV, films radio and tapes);
non-use of language laboratories;
use of blackboard but non-use of pictures and "props";
use of text books and printed drill material;
reading and listening given priority over speaking and writing (NOTE: to be treated with extreme caution);
pronunciation taught by imitation together with explanations of how sounds are made;
fluency less important than correctness of pronunciation though no unanimity about this;
use of translation.

If one then sums up the difference between G/T and other methods, the following can be noted:

in a comparison of LEDM, MDM, EC and G/T there would be a descending scale from LEDM for the use of English alone for explanations so that the amount of Swedish used would increase in progression from LEDM through MDM and EC to G/T;
the use of rules to explain grammar would be on an increasing scale from LEDM through MDM and EC to G/T;
in fluency versus correct pronunciation LEDM would concentrate on fluency and MDM and EC would give equal emphasis to both while G/T would perhaps give greater emphasis to correctness of pronunciation rather than fluency;
the time given to speaking would be on a descending scale from LEDM through MDM and EC to G/T.

It must be stressed again that this is a pooling of opinion from one sample of experts and does not represent any one expert's description of these various methods. Therefore no one expert would agree with the above conclusions as the results show considerable divergence of opinion as between individuals (hence the lack of clarity in the language teaching controversy in Sweden). However, it is believed that if the above conclusions were presented to experts they might well be able to accept the distinguishing characteristics of each method, as described above.

We can now use these descriptions of the four different teaching approaches to investigate what approach was in most use in English teaching in Swedish schools at the time of this investigation and to see, as was stated by some during the Language Learning Controversy, if an extreme Direct Method was widespread at that time.

Chapter IV

TEACHER PERCEPTION OF TEACHING METHODS

As mentioned earlier, the teachers who took part in the IEA survey in *grundskolan, fackskolan* and *gymnasium* were administered questionnaires to do with their teaching and qualifications. 45 items were selected for this study from those questionnaires (IEA TQ 5 and IEA TQ 7 cf. Lewis & Massad, 1975) and from the special National Board of Education questionnaire administered at the same time (NBE). The NBE questionnaire amplified those questions which provided information on method in the IEA questionnaires and thus yielded more detailed information (See Appendix C). The two types of questionnaires therefore complement each other but will be dealt with separately below as the IEA questionnaires permit international comparison but the NBE questionnaire does not. The IEA questionnaires are available at the IEA Data Bank at the University of Stockholm. The answers of the Swedish teachers are given in Table IV:1.

Table IV:1 Answers of Swedish Teachers to IEA Teacher Questionnaires TQ 5 and TQ 7

Pop II N = 492	Pop IV N = 403			Pop II %	Pop IV %
Source					
TQ 5	Item 24		using text books often	98.5	99.1
TQ 5	Item 25		using printed drill material often	60.2	47.7
TQ 5	Item 29		using AV often: TV, films, slides, radio etc.	60.5	56.7
TQ 5	Item 31		using Lectures often	0.7	1.3
TQ 7			using students' mother tongue often at:		
	Item 19	(i)	Beginners level	53.6	50.0
	Item 20	(ii)	Intermediate Level	53.2	57.1
	Item 21	(iii)	Advanced level	37.1	45.6
TQ 7	Item 22	In teaching Beginners English % given for ranked order of emphasis of skills:			
	Item 22	(i)	Listening Comprehension	69.4	55.0
	Item 23	(ii)	Speaking Fluency	31.8	31.4
	Item 24	(iii)	Reading Comprehension	36.4	29.7
	Item 25	(iv)	Correct pronunciation	23.5	16.7
		OR	Reading Comprehension	34.4	40.2
		OR	Speaking fluency	24.4	27.1
	Item 26	(v)	Ability to write	80.5	80.8
TQ 7	Item 27	% ranked order for introduction of spoken and written forms of English:			
		(i)	Spoken forms first, but written and spoken forms learned together	57.4	48.8
		(ii)	Speech before written forms	26.8	21.2
		(iii)	Written forms first, but written and spoken forms learned together	15.6	29.2
		(iv)	Written forms before speech	0.2	0.8

Pop II N = 492	Pop IV N = 403			Pop II %	Pop IV %
TQ 7	Item 28	Teaching grammar % ranked order for:			
		(i)	A combination of inductive and deductive methods: the second language is learned by imitation and practice, after which grammar rules are explained to help in forming correct speech	92.3	92.8
		(ii)	Pupils learn rules of grammar formally and then apply them by translating sentences from one language to another	5.6	5.7
		(iii)	Pupils learn to speak and understand by imitating the teacher; from this they learn to speak grammatically, just as they learn to speak their native language	2.1	1.5
TQ 7	Item 29	Order of emphasis in teaching speaking skills:			
		(i)	Equal emphasis to fluency and correct pronunciation	72.0	74.0
		(ii)	Greater emphasis on fluency rather than correct pronunciation	22.2	17.3
		(iii)	Greater emphasis on correct pronunciation rather than fluency	5.8	8.7
TQ 7	Item 30	Order of methods of teaching pronunciation:			
		(i)	by making the pupils listen carefully and imitate	87.9	79.8
		(ii)	by giving practice in imitation, supplemented with explanations about how the sounds are made	11.5	19.4
		(iii)	no attention paid to correct pronunciation	0.6	0.8
TQ 7			teachers using following frequently:		
	Item 31:		the blackboard	96.6	96.4
	Item 32:		pictures	29.7	17.1
	Item 33:		"props" (various real objects)	8.0	5.3
	Item 37:		tape recorder (whole class)	97.2	95.1
	Item 38:		Lanuage laboratory (individualised tape recorders)	9.5	8.9

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Tables 7.5–7.10

International comparisons

(a) Population II

The following eight countries took part in the Population II study:
Belgium (French speaking), Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Thailand.

The following observations relate to Swedish teaching methods in an international perspective:

TQ 5 Item 29 Only Belgium (69.8 %) used the audio-visual (AV) approach more than Sweden (60.5 %). The other countries (with the exception of Israel) did not use this approach half as much.

TQ 7 Item 27 Sweden was the lowest of all the countries in introducing speech before written forms, and highest of all the countries except West Germany for preferring the approach: Spoken forms first, but the written and spoken forms learned together.

TQ 7 Item 28 Sweden was the lowest of all the countries in advocating the teaching of grammar through imitation only, "as children learn their own language", and highest of all the countries in using "patterns + rules".

TQ 7 Item 29 Sweden was the highest of all the countries in giving equal importance to fluency and correct pronunciation.

TQ 7 Item 30 Sweden was the highest of all the countries for teaching pronunciation through imitation only, and lowest of all the countries for giving explanations of how sounds are made.

TQ Items 32 and 33 Sweden was the lowest but one of all the countries in the use of pictures and "props".

TQ 7 Item 37 Sweden was the highest of all the countries in the use of "tape recorder – whole class".

(b) Population IV

The following ten countries took part in the Population IV study:
Belgium (French speaking), Chile, Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, Hungary, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, Sweden, Thailand.

TQ 5 Item 29 Sweden was highest of all the countries in the use of the AV approach.

TQ 7 Item 27 Sweden was again lowest of all the countries for introducing speech before written forms but in this case was highest of all the countries in the proportion (29.2 %) advocating:
Written forms first, but written and spoken forms learned together.

TQ 7 Item 28 Sweden again was the lowest of all the countries in practising the teaching of grammar through imitation only and was the highest but one (Sweden 92.8 % compared to West Germany 95.0 %) as regards using "patterns + rules".

TQ 7 Items 32 and 33 Sweden was lowest in the use of pictures and second lowest in the use of "props".

TQ 7 Item 37 Sweden was again highest in the use of "tape recorder – whole class".

On the basis of the IEA questionnaires (and using the "consensus" definition of the sample of experts, given in Chapter III) it appears possible to conclude that it would seem that in Grades 7 and 8 the majority of teachers in *grundskolan* did *not* use an LEDM approach if one judges by their approach to use of the mother tongue and the teaching of grammar. One must point out, however, that there was great individual variation among Swedish teachers as to the amount of mother tongue usage in the classroom. Therefore in this respect one teacher might be nearer to an LEDM approach than another. The majority of teachers, however, appeared to be nearest to an MDM approach.

By the same criteria, the majority of teachers in *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* would be MDM rather than LEDM, but again the wide variation in the amount of mother tongue usage must be taken into account. Certainly, however, as far as the teaching of grammar is concerned, both in *grundskolan* and at the upper secondary stage, teachers appeared not to use an LEDM approach.

In an international comparison, at both the primary and secondary stages, Sweden did not appear to lean more towards LEDM than other countries. As far as use of the mother tongue is concerned, Sweden was firmly in the middle coming 5th at the Population II level and 6th at the Population IV level. As regards the teaching of grammar, as we have seen, Sweden was furthest away from the LEDM approach at the Population II level and next furthest away at the Population IV level. This with Sweden's strongly AV approach compared to other countries makes Sweden's teaching methods at the time appear to be more MDM than those used in other countries.

However, the above results are based on teachers' perceptions of what they do in teaching and the only method by which the accuracy of teachers' statements can be validated, in this study, is by comparing what the teachers said they do in teaching with

their pupils' experience in the classroom. Table IV:2 shows pupils' experience of English teaching at the time of the IEA Survey (cf. Selected Features of the English Language Experience of Students. Lewis & Massad, 1975.)

Table IV:2 Students' Perception of Classroom Activities

Pop II N = 2454	Pop IV N = 1767		
% of students whose English classroom activities include:		Pop II %	Pop IV %
Item			
17	Speaking English to the teacher:		
	often	31.0	42.4
	sometimes	52.0	46.8
	rarely or never	17.0	10.8
18	Speaking in Swedish:		
	often	51.3	30.7
	sometimes	43.6	58.1
	rarely or never	5.1	11.2
20	Listening to records, radio or TV programmes or films in the English language:		
	often	54.1	39.6
	sometimes	36.7	49.8
	rarely or never	9.2	10.6
21	Repeating taped, filmed or broadcast oral exercises in English:		
	often	20.3	4.8
	sometimes	44.8	30.9
	rarely or never	34.9	64.2
22	Writing exercises in English:		
	often	48.1	15.3
	sometimes	44.7	54.6
	rarely or never	7.2	30.2
23	Translation from or into English:		
	often	42.9	31.8
	sometimes	49.3	56.3
	rarely or never	7.8	11.9
24	Writing essays in English:		
	often	5.8	9.7
	sometimes	40.2	59.8
	rarely or never	54.1	30.4
25	Reading of short passages for detailed study:		
	often	33.3	42.3
	sometimes	44.7	42.6
	rarely or never	22.0	15.2
26	Reading for pleasure:		
	often	10.0	12.6
	sometimes	51.0	56.3
	rarely or never	39.0	31.0

NOTE: not all answered every question in the questionnaires although generally 95 % of the sample responded to most questions. Percentages are based only on those who answered a question.
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Tables 8.7 and 8.8.

International comparisons

The following observations concerning Swedish students' perceptions of teaching practices in English, as seen in an international perspective, can be made as regards both Population II and Population IV:

Item 17 Speaking English to the teacher *often*: Sweden had the lowest percentage except for Thailand (with 14.2 %) in Population II, but had the fourth lowest percentage in (42.4 %) in Population IV. The highest percentages were found in: Hungary 81.6 %; Germany 61.2 %; Israel 52.7 %

Item 18 Speaking in mother tongue *often*: Sweden had the next highest percentage after Thailand (who had 81.8 %) in Population II. In Population IV Sweden had the fourth lowest percentage (Germany, Israel and Hungary having lower percentages)

Item 20 Listening to records, radio etc., often: in Population II Sweden was second highest; and in Population IV also was second highest, (in both cases Israel being the highest)

Item 22 Writing exercises in English often: in both populations Sweden was the lowest

Item 23 Translation from and into English often: in Population II Sweden was the third highest and in Population IV the fourth lowest

Item 24 Writing essays in English often: in Population II Sweden was the second lowest and in Population IV the fourth lowest

Item 26 Reading for pleasure often: Sweden was lowest in Population II and in Population IV was fourth lowest.

If the students' perceptions are then compared with the teachers' the following points of particular interest emerge:

(i) Teachers: using Swedish often at the Intermediate Level (Grades 7–9 *grundskolan*): 53.2 %
Students: speaking in Swedish often at the Population II level: 51.3 %

(ii) Teachers: using Swedish often at the Advanced Level (*fackskolan* and *gymnasium*): 46.0 %
Students: speaking Swedish often at the Population IV level: 30.7 %

(iii) Teachers: using AV often (TV, slides, films, radio, etc.): 60.5 % at the Population II level
Students: listening to records, radio or TV, or films often: 54.1 % at the Population II level

(iv) Teachers: using AV often (TV, slides, films, radio etc.) at the Population IV level: 56.7 %
Students: listening to records, radio or TV programmes, or films often at the Population IV level: 39.6 %

Obviously the questionnaires do not allow of precise comparisons since the responses, at best, indicate the respondents' perceptions. However, there is no striking discrepancy between the students' perception of the amount of Swedish used in the classroom at either level, although the figures for the Population IV level indicate that even if approximately half of the teachers at that level used Swedish often in the classroom this does not necessarily mean that their pupils responded in Swedish. This is supported by the difference in students' perception of the amount of English they speak at the two levels viz.

Population II: 31.0 % thought they spoke English to the teacher often; whereas in
Population IV: 42.4 % thought they spoke English often to the teacher

Moreoever, the fact that at the Population II level 42.9 % of the students thought they had translation often also agrees with the figure of 53.6 % of teachers who often used Swedish at that level. Again, however, there is a larger discrepancy in points of view at the

Population IV level where 31.8 % of students believe they often had translation as compared to 46.0 % of teachers who said they often used Swedish at that level. In any case, however, the figures for the students' perceptions of their use of Swedish and translation in no way support the view that LEDM was universally used in Swedish schools. Nor do the international comparisons suggest that Sweden had in 1971 adopted a teaching stance which was more LEDM than in other countries.

Moreoever, there is one other source to check the teachers response to the IEA questionnaires and that is the teachers' response to the National Board of Education (NBE) questionnaire administered at the same time as the IEA study. In this case it was possible to divide the teachers by grades rather than by population levels as in the main IEA study. The numbers of teachers replying at each grade level are given in Table IV:3.

Table IV:3 Numbers of Teachers Answering NBE Questionnaire Items 9–20
N of teachers answering at each grade level
(For Items, see Appendix C)

Grade	7 all	7 sär	8 all	8 sär	9 all	9 sär	Fa 1	Fa 2	Gy 1	Gy 2	Gy 3
Item											
9	130	215	120	217	117	227	345	205	347	336	315
10	118	210	115	216	117	225	344	203	341	333	306
11	127	209	118	213	120	226	346	205	346	334	305
12	126	206	116	214	120	226	344	202	345	332	306
13	124	212	121	212	120	228	349	208	354	340	311
14	125	213	122	215	122	230	350	207	351	340	315
15	122	215	121	216	121	229	350	209	352	338	309
16	119	214	115	214	123	226	340	203	349	335	306
17	124	214	118	218	124	228	344	206	346	335	309
18	121	213	116	215	121	228	346	208	351	337	313
19	123	211	116	218	121	229	344	208	351	338	310
20	122	209	116	216	120	230	347	205	352	339	313
Mean	123.4	211.8	117.8	215.3	120.5	227.7	345.8	205.8	348.8	336.4	309.8
SD	3.2	2.7	2.3	1.8	2.0	1.6	2.9	2.3	3.6	2.6	3.5

NOTE: 7 all: Grade 7 in *grundskolan allmän kurs* = general course
7 sär: Grade 7 in *grundskolan särskild kurs* = special course (this course included a greater language content and would generally be regarded as more difficult than the general course)
8 all = Grade 8 *grundskolan allmän kurs* = general course
8 sär = Grade 8 *grundskolan särskild kurs* = special course (see Note to 7 sär above)
9 all = Grade 9 *grundskolan allmän kurs* = general course
9 sär = Grade 9 *grundskolan särskild kurs* = special course (see Note to 7 sär above)
Fa 1 = the first year in *fackskolan* (i.e. the Swedish Continuation School for those taking more practical and less academic courses)
Fa 2 = the second (and final) year in *fackskolan*
Gy 1 = the first year in *gymnasium* (equivalent to the upper stages of the grammar school)
Gy 2 = the second year in *gymnasium*
Gy 3 = the third (and final – except for certain technology students –) year in *gymnasium*

It can be seen that the numbers of teachers answering at each grade level were reasonably constant throughout the items and were well grouped around the mean in each case. This seemed to warrant an analysis of the teachers' answers to the selected items from the NBE questionnaire.

A detailed presentation of the distribution of the answers is given in Appendix C except for teachers' estimations of time distribution of classroom activities which are given in Table IV:4. It should be noted, however, that in this table *grundskolan* courses are not divided into *allmän* and *särskild* as such a distinction was not asked for in the questionnaire.

Table IV:4 Percentage of Total Teaching Time Given to Practising Different Skills at Each Grade Level, in Teachers' Perception

(Percentages rounded to whole numbers) Source: NBE questionnaire Item 3a.	*grundskolan*			*fackskolan*		*gymnasium*		
Grade:	7	8	9	1	2	1	2	3
Reading (both extensive and reading aloud)	15 %	15 %	16 %	19 %	19 %	18 %	20 %	22 %
Writing (both guided writing practice and free writing)	17 %	18 %	17 %	14 %	16 %	14 %	14 %	14 %
Listening (Listening Comprehension: longer passages)	11 %	11 %	11 %	11 %	10 %	10 %	11 %	11 %
Speaking (guided speech practice of the pattern practice type AND non-guided speech practice and conversation AND pronunciation practice, either chorally or individually)	31 %	29 %	27 %	28 %	27 %	28 %	28 %	28 %
TOTAL	74 %	73 %	71 %	72 %	72 %	70 %	73 %	75 %
Vocabulary (study)	8 %	8 %	7 %	7 %	8 %	8 %	8 %	7 %
Grammar (study)	8 %	8 %	10 %	9 %	8 %	10 %	9 %	6 %
Translation (from and into English)	12 %	11 %	12 %	13 %	14 %	12 %	11 %	12 %
TOTAL	28 %	27 %	29 %	29 %	30 %	30 %	28 %	25 %
GRAND TOTAL	102 %	100 %	100 %	101 %	102 %	100 %	101 %	100 %

Again, one should emphasise that there can be no absolute precision in a subjective assessment about one's own distribution of teaching time. Hence the fact that the mean percentages have been adjusted to whole per cents. It should also be noted that although the teacher is engaged in a particular practice it does not necessarily follow that all the pupils are active. Indeed the UME project's observation of classroom activity at the Grade 7 level in 1966 noted that an average pupil at the Grade 7 level would spend 15.6 % of classroom time in complete inactivity (von Mentzer, 1970). However, it is interesting to note that the figures given for time spent on reading in *gymnasium* and the small amount to time devoted to grammar study in the third year of the *gymnasium* course are supported by the observations of school inspectors (Danielsson, 1972; Eriksson, 1971). Eriksson who was inspecting the teaching of English during the academic year 1970/71 (the time the IEA study took place) noted that:

> "The new *gymnasium* has to a large extent abandoned the systematic grammar and writing training that obtained before and instead takes up grammatical phenomena as they arise in the text being read. As at the *gymnasium* level 'pre-fabricated' texts are not used this has led to a certain randomness in the study of grammar"
> (My translation, Eriksson, 1971, p. 2)

Danielsson, whose report covers the academic year after the IEA study took place, stated:

> "... still to far too little an extent is a clear distinction between intensive and extensive study maintained. Questioning on allegedly 'extensive' texts can take up a whole lesson and be concerned with details. The pupils' (and the teachers')

dissatisfaction with the teaching situation (and with the construction of text books with, for example, unilingual word lists) seems to be caused by this practice." (My translation. Danielsson, 1972, p. 2).

One can also note that at all grade levels the nearest definition of teachers' practice to the definitions given by the sample of experts for classroom activities would be EC.

Further, from the material presented in Appendix C it is possible to draw a number of conclusions as regards teaching methods in schools as perceived by the teachers. It should be noted that in these conclusions the following categories are used with the meanings given below:

"tend strongly" means that 67 %–89 % of the teachers asked say that they teach in this way;

"tend very strongly" means that 90 % or more of the teachers asked say that they teach in this way

Again the percentages have been arrived at by dichotomies, the teachers being placed in one of two categories:

Favourable towards a teaching practice (using the designation "quite often/"nearly always")

Unfavourable towards a teaching practice (using the designation "never/seldom")

The tables in Appendix C show the percentages for "never" on its own and "nearly always" on its own so that the two extremes of the scale can be judged.

Teaching Methods

I: For *grundskolan* Grades 7, 8 and 9

A) *allmän* (general course)

a) *Grammar teaching*

(i) Rules in connection with pattern practices: the teachers were split 50/50 on whether or not to give rules in connection with pattern practices but tended to give rules more in Grade 9 than they did in Grades 7 and 8

(ii) they were split almost 50/50 on whether or not to give a rule as a summing up conclusion in pattern practices, but tended to give a rule slightly more in Grades 8 and 9 than they did in Grade 7 so that this tendency exhibits a rising curve from Grade 7 to Grade 9

(iii) they tended strongly towards *not* using the method "memorisation of grammatical examples" (though less strongly at the Grade 8 level)

(iv) they tended strongly *not* to use the method "Learning Definite Rules" to teach grammar

(v) they tended very strongly (close to 100 %) *not* to teach grammar by means of systematic study of the grammar book

(vi) they tended towards teaching grammar in connection with the text being studied at the Grade 7 level though this tendency was less at that level than at the Grade 8 and 9 level where it was strong.

b) *Use of native language*

(i) they tended very strongly *not* to use English alone to explain grammar; but they tended strongly towards using Swedish alone for the explanation of grammar; and tended *not* to explain grammar by means of a combination of English and Swedish (this tendency was very strong at the Grade 7 level, but less than very strong in Grades 8 and 9).

(ii) they tended towards explaining new vocabulary by only giving a Swedish translation; they tended strongly *not* to give an explanation in English alone; but tended strongly towards giving an English explanation in combination with a Swedish translation.

B) *särskild* (special course)

a) *Grammar teaching*

(i) Pattern practices and giving rules in this connection: the teachers tended *not* to give pattern practices without rules, and this tendency was strong in Grades 8 and 9

(ii) they tended strongly to the method of giving a rule as a summing up/conclusion to pattern practices and this tendency was very strong in Grades 8 and 9

(iii) they tended *not* to use the method "memorisation of grammatical examples" in Grade 7 but in Grades 8 and 9 the tendency was more towards 50/50 as to whether to do this or not

(iv) on the learning of definite rules of grammar, they were split about 50/50 for the Grade 7 and Grade 8 levels; but for Grade 9 tended towards using this method

(v) they tended *not* to use the method of going through the grammar book systematically but this is a decreasing curve from Grade 7 to Grade 9 so that while this tendency was very strong at the Grade 7 level and strong at the Grade 8 level, in Grade 9 there was a one third chance that this method was used.

(vi) there was a strong to very strong tendency to teach grammar in connection with the text book being studied

b) *Use of native language*

(i) teachers tended strongly *not* to use English alone to explain grammar; but tended strongly to use Swedish alone to explain grammar; while they were split about 50/50 on the question as to whether to use a combination of English or Swedish or not. The tendency in fact was to use more English the higher the grade level was.

(ii) In explaining new vocabulary, the teachers at the Grade 7 level were split about 50/50 on the question of explanation by translation into Swedish only; at the Grade 8 level they tended *not* to only give a Swedish translation; and in Grade 9 they tended strongly *not* to merely give a Swedish translation. The same tendency is apparent when it comes to explaining new vocabulary in English alone: for Grade 7 the tendency was about 50 % for and 50 % against. However, at the Grade 8 level the tendency was more in favour of giving English explanations alone; while at the Grade 9 level, this tendency to use English for explanations increased again. At all levels, teachers tended strongly to give explanations in English in combination with a Swedish translation, although the tendency to do this decreased as the grade became higher, thus confirming the tendency above that the higher the teacher's perception of the grade level was, the more English that was used.

II: For *fackskolan* (the Continuation School)

a) *Grammar teaching*

(i) Pattern practices and giving rules: the teachers tended strongly *not* to give pattern practices without rules

(ii) they tended strongly to give a rule as a summing up/conclusion to pattern practices

(iii) they tended towards using the method "memorisation of grammatical examples", but less strongly in Fa 2 than in Fa 1

(iv) they were split 50/50 on the learning of definite rules for grammar (see *särskild* courses *grundskolan* Grades 7, 8 and 9)

(v) they tended strongly (75 % or more) *not* to go through the grammar book systematically

(vi) they tended very strongly (90 % or more) to teach grammar in connection with the text being studied

b) *Use of native language*

(i) they tended strongly *not* to use English alone to explain grammar; but tended strongly to use Swedish alone for the explanation of grammar; and were split 50/50 on the use of combined English and Swedish explanations of grammar

(ii) they were split 50/50 on giving an explanation of new vocabulary in Swedish alone; and were split 50/50 on giving an explanation in English alone; but tended strongly towards giving an explanation in English together with a Swedish translation

III: For *gymnasium* (Upper Grammar School)

a) *Grammar teaching*

(i) Pattern practices and the giving of rules in connection with them: the teachers tended strongly *not* to use pattern practices without giving rules

(ii) they tended strongly to give a rule as a summing up/conclusion to pattern practices (although the tendency is less strong in Gy 3)

(iii) they were split 50/50 on whether or not to use the method "memorisation of grammatical examples" (although in Gy 3 they tended a little more towards *not* using this technique)

(iv) they were split 50/50 on the learning of definite rules for grammar (although Gy 3 teachers were more against than for; while Gy 1 and Gy 2 teachers were more for than against)

(v) they tended *not* to teach grammar by systematically going through the grammar book, in an increasing curve from Gy 1 to Gy 3; so that at the Gy 1 level the tendency was little more than 50/50 (in the NOT direction) whereas at the Gy 3 level the tendency was strongly against a systematic going through of the grammar book.

(vi) they tended very strongly to teach grammar in connection with the text being studied

b) *Use of native language*

(i) they tended *not* to explain grammar in English alone, though on a decreasing curve from Gy 1 to Gy 3, so that in Gy 1 the tendency was strongly towards not using English for grammatical explanations while at the Gy 3 level the tendency was almost 50/50; they tended towards using Swedish alone for grammatical explanations but again on a decreasing curve so that at the Gy 3 level the tendency was 50/50; there was also a decreasing curve from Gy 1 to Gy 3 in the use of a combination of English and Swedish to explain grammar with a slightly greater tendency to use this method in Gy 1 and a 50/50 tendency in Gy 3.

(ii) they tended *not* to use Swedish alone for explaining new vocabulary and tended strongly towards giving explanations of vocabulary in English combined with a Swedish translation; they also tended towards giving an explanation in English alone in Gy 1 and Gy 2 and tended strongly towards giving English explanations only in Gy 3.

TO SUM UP:

For all levels (*grundskolan, fackskolan* and *gymnasium*):

(i) the more "academic" the pupils were (in the teachers' perception) the more teachers used rules to explain grammar

(ii) the less "academic" the pupils were (in the teachers' perception) the less teachers used "academic" explanations of grammar

(iii) the higher the perceived standard of the class, the more teachers used English for explanations, certainly of vocabulary and also in grammar, though less strongly in grammar than in vocabulary teaching

(iv) the lower the perceived standard of the pupils' English knowledge, the less teachers used English for explanations (both for grammar and vocabulary) and the more they used Swedish.

It can be seen that the items selected from the NBE questionnaire concentrated on two aspects: grammar teaching and the use of the native language in explanations. How well then do the findings from the NBE questionnaire correspond to the results of the IEA enquiry in these respects?

Firstly, it can be seen that as regards the use of rules in grammar teaching there are far greater nuances in the teachers' replies to the NBE questionnaire. Whereas 92.3 % of the teachers in the IEA enquiry stated they used a combination of inductive and deductive methods for teaching grammar in Grades 7 and 8 in *grundskolan*, we find in the NBE study that this is true of the *särskild* courses but not so in the *allmän* courses. This does not invalidate either questionnaire; it merely means that teachers used different methods with different types of groups and therefore one must ask what type of group is being taught (and at what level) before one can be certain what method a teacher will use. The teachers in fact appear to have a greater appreciation of the necessity of adapting the method to the group than many of those who took part in the language controversy of 1969/70 or indeed anyone who persists in calling for one method of teaching to be used at all ages and all levels. It is noteworthy, too, that the teachers in *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* were divided almost 50/50 on the question of learning definite rules of grammar as an aid in learning, while at the same time a majority did not teach grammar by means of a systematic study of the grammar book. Spolsky (1965) has pointed out that a grammar book for a teacher and for a learner are different things and university disputants in the language controversy have not made a sufficiently clear distinction between the two. Explanations of grammar need to be couched not in linguistic jargon but in language that the non-specialist can understand (whether in English or Swedish) but more importantly the need is for the exercise of a limited number of grammatical phenomena structured as a systematic progression as part of the *gymnasium* course (Eriksson, 1971; Danielsson, 1972). Eriksson states:

> "A continuation of *grundskolan's* methods with short systematic practice sessions during which the most important structures are learned and other and further common grammatical phenomena are practised would give greater grammatical sureness". (My translation. Eriksson, 1971, p. 3)

Secondly, the figures for the numbers of teachers who used Swedish in their teaching, according to the IEA survey, have been given some amplification by the NBE enquiry which shows again that teachers adapted the use of mother tongue to the type of group they were teaching so that the lower the standard of the group was felt to be, the more teachers used Swedish for their explanations.

This leads directly to a comparison of teacher's perceptions of their methods and the definitions of the expert sample, to attempt to establish which language teaching method was being used in Swedish schools at the time of this survey.

Matching of Expert Definition of Methods with Teachers' Perception of Methods as Given in Reply to NBE Questionnaire

(NOTE: when the experts were split 50/50 on an issue this is noted in the following as: depending on expert consulted)

1) *grundskolan* Grades 7, 8 and 9, *allmän* courses:

a) teaching time allotted to various practices: the approach is EC

b) teaching grammar:

(i) for the 43.6 %–59.2 % of teachers who often did *not* give rules with pattern practices: either LEDM or MDM (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 40.8 %–56.4 % who often gave rules with pattern practices: either EC or G/T or MDM (the latter depending on expert consulted)

(ii) for the 49.2 %–58.1 % who often gave a rule as a summing up to pattern practices: either MDM or EC;
for the 41.9 %–50.8 % who seldom gave a rule as a summing up to pattern practices: either LEDM or G/T

(iii) for the 68.6 %–72.5 % who seldom used the method "memorisation of grammatical examples": LEDM or MDM or EC (latter two depending on expert consulted);
for the 27.5 %–31.4 % who often used this method: G/T or MDM or EC (depending on expert consulted for the latter two)

(iv) for the 83.3 %–85.0 % who seldom used the method of "learning definite rules": either LEDM or MDM or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 14.7 %–16.7 % who often used this method: either EC (depending on expert consulted) or G/T

(v) for the 97.5 %–99.2 % who seldom taught grammar by means of a systematic study of the grammar book: either LEDM or MDM or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 0.8 %–2.5 % who often did this: either G/T or EC (latter depending on expert consulted)

(vi) for the 60.0 %–70.5 % who often taught grammar in connection with the text being studied: either MDM or EC or LEDM or G/T (latter two depending on the expert consulted);
for the 29.5 %–40.0 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T (in both cases depending on expert consulted)

c) use of native language:

(i) for the 79.5 %–85.1 % who often explained grammar in Swedish alone: either G/T or MDM or EC (the latter two depending on expert consulted);
for the 14.9 %–20.5 % who seldom used Swedish alone to explain grammar: either LEDM or MDM or EC (for the latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 65.2 %–73.1 % who seldom used a combination of English and Swedish to explain grammar; either LEDM or G/T;
for the 26.9 %–34.8 % who did this often: either MDM or EC;
for the 94.9 %–97.6 % who seldom explained grammar in English alone: either EC or G/T or MDM (in the latter case depending on the expert consulted);
for the 2.4 %–5.1 % who often used English alone to explain grammar: either LEDM or MDM (the latter depending on the expert consulted)

(ii) for the 63.6 %–65.3 % who often used Swedish alone to explain new vocabulary: either GT or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 34.7 %–36.4 % who seldom used Swedish alone for explaining new vocabulary: either LEDM or MDM or EC (depending on expert consulted in the latter case);
for the 74.0 %–76.0 % who often used a combination of Swedish and English to explain new vocabulary: MDM or EC;
for the 24.0 %–26.0 % who seldom used a combination of Swedish and English in this way: either LEDM or G/T;
for the 75.0 %–83.6 % who seldom used English alone to explain new vocabulary: EC or G/T;
for the 16.4 %–25.0 % who often used English alone to explain new vocabulary: either LEDM or MDM.

Even on the above it would be untrue to say that an extreme Direct Method was used throughout Sweden in *allmän* courses in *grundskolan* at the time of this survey (and presumably at the time of the Language Controversy). However, the figures given above

might indicate that as high a percentage as 35 % of teachers consistently used the LEDM approach. To see if this is so, it is necessary to examine the percentages of teachers who took up an extreme position of the "Never" or "Nearly Always" type in response to the questions dealing with the use of rules in grammar teaching and use of Swedish or English for explanations. Table IV:5, therefore, gives the proportions of teachers of *allmän* courses in this sample who can be referred to the LEDM approach consistently.

Table IV:5 Percentage of Teachers in allmän Courses with LEDM Approach

Teaching technique			
a) Grammar	% of teachers of *allmän* courses		
			Grade
Pattern practice without giving a rule:	NEARLY ALWAYS:	23.1 %	7
		24.2 %	8
		12.0 %	9
Pattern practice with rule as summing up:	NEVER:	12.7 %	7
		8.7 %	8
		4.3 %	9
b) Use of Swedish alone:			
for grammatical explamations:	NEVER:	0.8 %	7
		2.5 %	8
		2.5 %	9
for vocabulary explanations:	NEVER:	5.0 %	7
		2.6 %	8
		0.8 %	9
c) Use of English alone:			
for grammatical explanations:	NEARLY ALWAYS:	0.8 %	7
		0.0 %	8
		0.0 %	9
for vocabulary explantions:	NEARLY ALWAYS:	1.6 %	7
		0.0 %	8
		0.0 %	9

If the teachers' perceptions of their own teaching practice in this sample adequately represent the practice of teachers of *allmän* courses in *grundskolan* throughout Sweden, then an extreme Direct Method for teaching English was not widespread at the time of this survey in these types of classes. It appears therefore that those who stated at the time of the Language Controversy that an Extreme Direct Method was *not* used in teaching languages in Swedish schools were right as far as English was concerned (Ellegård & Lindell, 1970, p. 109). Moreover, it appears that the methods used were nearer to those outlined by Hensjö (1959) than would perhaps have been thought by those who read the Language Controversy at the time.

Matching of Experts' Definition With Teachers' Perception of Teaching Methods

2) *grundskolan* Grades 7, 8 and 9 *särskild* courses
a) teaching time allotted to various practices: the approach is EC
b) teaching grammar:
   (i) for the 14.5 %–34.9 % of teachers who often did *not* give rules with pattern practices: either LEDM or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
   for the 65.1 %–85.5 % who often gave rules with pattern practices: EC or G/T or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted)

(ii) for the 83.8 %–93.3 % who often gave a rule as a summing up to a pattern practice: either MDM or EC;
for the 6.7 %–16.2 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T

(iii) for the 52.2 % -64.6 % who seldom used the method "memorisation of grammatical examples": either LEDM or MDM or EC (latter two depending on expert consulted);
for the 35.4 %–47.8 % who often used this method: either MDM, EC (both depending on the expert consulted) or G/T

(iv) for the 35.4 %–54.9 % who seldom used the method of "learning definite rules": either LEDM or MDM or EC (the latter depending on which expert was consulted);
for the 45.1 %–64.6 % who often used this method: either EC (depending on expert consulted) or G/T

(v) for the 66.7 %–94.3 % who seldom taught grammar by a systematic study of the grammar book: either LEDM or MDM or EC (the latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 5.7 %–33.3 % that often taught grammar this way: either EC (depending on expert consulted) or G/T

(vi) for the 87.3 %–93.0 % who often taught grammar in connection with the text being studied: either MDM or EC or LEDM or G/T (the latter two depending on the expert consulted);
for the 7.0 %–12.7 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T (in both cases depending on the expert consulted)

c) use of native language:

(i) for the 71.2 %–82.3 % who explained grammar in Swedish alone often: either G/T or MDM or EC (the two latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 17.7 %–28.8 % who seldom explained grammar in Swedish alone: either LEDM or MDM or EC (for the last two depending on expert consulted);
for the 40.3 %–48.6 % who seldom used a combination of Swedish and English to explain grammar; either LEDM or G/T;
for the 51.4 %–59.7 % who often did this: either MDM or EC;
for the 74.1 %–88.8 % who seldom explained grammar in English alone: either EC or G/T or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 11.2 %–25.9 % who often explained grammar in English alone: either LEDM or MDM (the latter depending on the expert consulted)

(ii) for the 30.3 %–42.3 % who often explained new vocabulary in Swedish alone: either G/T or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 57.7 %–69.7 % who seldom explained new vocabulary in Swedish alone: either LEDM or MDM or EC (depending on expert consulted in the latter case);
for the 78.2 %–84.4 % who often used a combination of English and Swedish to explain new vocabulary: MDM or EC.
for the 15.6 %–21.8 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T;
for the 36.1 %–57.9 % who seldom used English alone to explain new vocabulary: EC or G/T;
for the 42.1 %–63.9 % who often used English alone to explain vocabulary: either LEDM or MDM.

Again it is necessary to see what proportions take up an extreme position of the "Never" or "Nearly Always" type. Table IV:6 gives the proportions of teacher in *särskild* courses in the sample who can be referred to the LEDM approach.

Table IV:6 Percentage of Teachers in särskild Courses with an LEDM Approach

Teaching technique	% of teachers in *särskild* courses		Grade
a) Grammar			
Pattern practice without giving a rule:	NEARLY ALWAYS:	4.2 %	7
		4.6 %	8
		2.2 %	9
Pattern practice with rule as a summing up:	NEVER:	1.4 %	7
		0.9 %	8
		1.3 %	9
b) Use of Swedish alone:			
(i) for grammatical explanations:	NEVER:	2.8 %	7
		0.5 %	8
		4.4 %	9
(ii) for vocabulary explanations:	NEVER:	5.2 %	7
		0.5 %	8
		8.3 %	9
c) Use of English alone:			
(i) for grammatical explanations:	NEARLY ALWAYS:	0.0 %	7
		1.8 %	8
		3.1 %	9
(ii) for vocabulary explanations:	NEARLY ALWAYS:	3.8 %	7
		7.9 %	8
		15.2 %	9

Again, if these figures are representative then the extreme Direct Method was in no way widespread in Sweden in *särskild* courses in the upper levels of *grundskolan* at the time of this investigation.

It is interesting to note, too, that these figures support the tendency, noted here earlier, for teachers to use more English for explanation the more the pupils advance through the system of education. However, the fact that in both *allmän* and *särskild* courses teachers were divided approximately 50/50 on some approaches in language teaching means that a child's experience of language learning would vary greatly according to which class he happens to find himself in (See Table IV:7).

Table IV:7 Approaches to Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary on which grundskolan Teachers Were Very Divided

In *allmän* courses the points concerned are:			
(i) pattern practice without giving a rule:	NEVER/SELDOM	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS	Grade
	48.5 %	51.5 %	7
	40.8 %	59.2 %	8
	56.4 %	43.6 %	9
(ii) pattern practice with a rule as summing-up/conclusion:			
	50.8 %	49.2 %	7
	45.2 %	54.8 %	8
	41.9 %	58.1 %	9
In *särskild* courses the points concerned are:			
(a) "memorisation of examples" to teach grammar:			
	56.3 %	43.7 %	8
	52.2 %	47.8 %	9

	NEVER/SELDOM	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS	Grade
(b) explanation of grammar by a combination of English and Swedish:			
	48.6 %	51.4 %	7
	41.1 %	58.9 %	8
	40.3 %	59.7 %	9
(c) explanation of new vocabulary in Swedish alone:			
	57.7 %	42.3 %	7
(d) explanation of new vocabulary in English alone:			
	57.9 %	42.1 %	7
	43.1 %	56.9 %	8

Discussion of Teaching Methods in *Grundskolan*

The fact that teachers are so divided in their approaches here is in no way a criticism of the teachers but it is a reflection of our current state of knowledge about language learning. The GUME Reports showed no difference in learning at the Grade 7 level whether no explanations of grammar were given at all or whether an explanation was given in English or in Swedish (Levin, 1969). Jensen (1972) puts forward the idea of two levels of intelligence: Level I and Level II. Level I he calls associative ability and Level II conceptual ability and says:

> "Level I involves the neural registration and consolidation of stimulus inputs and the formation of associations . . . there is a high correspondence between the forms of the stimulus input and the form of the response output. Level I ability is tapped mostly by tests such as digit memory, serial rote learning, selective trial-and-error learning with reinforcement (feedback) for correct responses, and in slightly less 'pure' form by free recall of visually or verbally presented materials and paired-associate learning. Level II abilities, on the other hand, involve self-initiated elaboration and transformation of the stimulus input before it eventuates in an overt response. Concept learning and problem solving are good examples. The subject must actively manipulate the input to arrive at the output." (Jensen, op.cit., p. 195)

Piaget's theories state that the stage of formal operations begins "at about eleven or twelve years of age" (Piaget, 1962, p. 126) but it is not certain in the development of the *individual* child at what exact age the stage of formal operations begins to develop nor when this stage is concluded. Lenneberg's biological theory of language states that primary language acquisition occurs between the ages of two or three and puberty by "an interaction of maturation and self-programmed learning" (that is human beings have a language learning mechanism) but that "After puberty, the ability for self-organization and adjustment to the physiological demands of verbal behavior quickly declines" (Lenneberg, 1967, p. 158)

It is tempting to think that as our innate language learning capacity declines, so our ability to perform more complicated conceptual processes increases. Whether or not this is true, different individuals are at different stages of development and as Jensen points out age, heredity and environment all play their part. Moreover, as Gage has noted:

> "The influences that produce learning are described by theories of learning. Such theories fall into three broad categories: conditioning theories, imitation theories, and cognitive theories . . . One basic proposition is that learning may not go on in the same way for all behaviors learned. Some things may be learned by one process and some by another." (Gage, 1972, p. 43)

Teachers therefore must make their choice according to what they think the particular group they are teaching need and can master. As stated earlier here, it would appear that in *grundskolan* Swedish teachers of English tended to take a more cognitive method with those classes they judged to be capable of an academic approach; and conditioning and imitation approaches with those they judged to be less academic. What is necessary is that educationalists "build upon abilities which are present in the child" (Eysenck, 1971, p. 138) and this seems to be the method adopted by teachers of English in *grundskolan.* Further, Carroll states:

> "I do not believe that either a pure 'audiolingual habit theory' or a pure 'cognitive-code learning theory' is a correct and comprehensive one. Each of these theories is to some extent wrong or incomplete. Yet each theory has elements of truth and value. In saying this I am not simply being 'eclectic'. Instead, I am trying to suggest a meaningful synthesis. Just what name we should use for a synthesized theory, I am not sure. If it does not seem too flip to do so, let us call it a 'cognitive habit-formation theory'."[a] (Carroll, 1971, p. 110)

(See also Dunlop (1970) where a combination of an S–R and a "generative" approach is suggested.)

For different aspects of language learning therefore different approaches are needed for students of differing abilities and ages, or as Carroll puts it:

> "In language teaching, as in other kinds of instruction, probably the critical factor in success is in managing the learning procedures of the student in such a way that at any given stage of learning the student is learning just what he needs to learn, being given the appropriate strategy for that learning to take place, and being properly reinforced in that learning." (Carroll, 1971, p. 113)

It appears that teachers of English in *grundskolan* have been using this approach on a grade basis; the next step would be to continue this approach on an *individual* basis.

To return to the analysis of teaching practices, this time at the upper secondary level:

Matching of Experts' Definition with Teachers' Perception of Teaching Methods

3) *fackskolan*
a) teaching time allotted to various practices: the approach is EC
b) teaching grammar:
   (i) for the 19 %–23.5 % of teachers who often did *not* give rules with pattern practices: either LEDM or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
   for the 76.5 %–81.0 % who often gave rules with pattern practices: EC or G/T or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted)

---

[a] "The audio-lingual habit theory . . . has the following principal ideas:
1) that since speech is primary and writing secondary, the habits to be learned must be learned first of all as auditory discrimination responses and speech responses.
2) that habits must be automatized as much as possible so that they can be called forth without conscious attention.
3) that the automatization of habits occurs chiefly by practice, that is, by repetition . . . The cognitive-code learning theory, on the other hand, may be thought of as a modified up-to-date grammar-translation theory. According to this theory, learning a language is a process of acquiring conscious control of the phonological, grammatical and lexical patterns of a second language, largely through study and analysis of these patterns as a body of knowledge." (Carroll, 1965, p. 280)

(ii) for the 85.8 %–88.7 % who often gave a rule as a summing up/conclusion to pattern practices: either MDM or EC;
for the 11.3 %–14.2 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T

(iii) for the 57.1 %–61.6 % who seldom used the method "memorisation of grammatical examples": either LEDM or MDM or EC (latter two depending on expert consulted);
for the 38.4 %–42.9 % who often used this method: either MDM or EC (both depending on the expert consulted) or G/T

(iv) for the 51.5 %–56.1 % who seldom used the method of "learning definite rules": either LEDM or MDM or EC (the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 43.9 %–48.5 % who often used this method: either EC (depending on the expert consulted) or G/T

(v) for the 76.8 %–76.9 % who seldom taught grammar by a systematic study of the grammar book: either LEDM or MDM or EC (the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 23.0 %–23.2 % who often taught grammar this way: either EC (depending on the expert consulted) or G/T

(vi) for the 94.0 %–94.2 % who often taught grammar in connection with the text being studied: either MDM or EC or LEDM or G/T (the latter two depending on the expert consulted);
for the 5.8 %–6.0 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T (in both cases depending on the expert consulted)

c) use of native language:

(i) for the 69.4 %–76 % who often explained grammar in Swedish alone: either G/T or MDM or EC (the two latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 24.0 %–30.6 % who seldom explained grammar in Swedish alone: either LEDM or MDM or EC (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 42.4 %–45.9 % who seldom used a combination of English and Swedish to explain grammar: either LEDM or G/T;
for the 54.1 %–57.6 % who often used a combination of English and Swedish to explain grammar: either MDM or EC;
for the 77.7 %–84.3 % who seldom explained grammar in English alone: either EC or G/T or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 15.7 %–22.3 % who often explained grammar in English alone: either LEDM or MDM (the latter depending on the expert consulted)

(ii) for the 44.7 %–46.5 % who often explained new vocabulary in Swedish alone: either G/T or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 53.5 %–55.3 % who seldom explained new vocabulary in Swedish alone: either LEDM or MDM or EC (depending on expert consulted in the latter case);
for the 79.8 %–81.1 % who often used a combination of English and Swedish to explain new vocabulary: MDM or EC;
for the 18.9 %–20.2 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T;
for the 45.4 %–58.8 % who seldom used English alone to explain new vocabulary: either EC or G/T;
for the 41.2 %–54.6 % who often used English alone to explain new vocabulary: either LEDM or MDM.

With the comparisons presented above in mind it is necessary to see what proportions took up an extreme position of the "Never" or "Nearly Always" type. Table IV:8 gives the proportions of teachers in this sample of *fackskolan* who can be referred to the LEDM approach.

Table IV:8 Percentage of Teachers in fackskolan with an LEDM Approach

Teaching technique	% of *fackskolan* teachers		Grade
a) Grammar			
(i) Pattern practice without giving a rule	NEARLY ALWAYS:	2.0 %	Fa 1
		2.4 %	Fa 2
(ii) Pattern practice with a rule as summing up	NEVER:	1.5 %	Fa 1
		2.0 %	Fa 2
b) Use of Swedish alone:			
(i) for grammatical explanations	NEVER:	4.3 %	Fa 1
		5.7 %	Fa 2
(ii) for vocabulary explanations	NEVER:	3.8 %	Fa 1
		6.7 %	Fa 2
c) Use of English alone:			
(i) for grammatical explanations	NEARLY ALWAYS:	2.0 %	Fa 1
		1.9 %	Fa 2
(ii) for vocabulary explanations	NEARLY ALWAYS:	3.5 %	Fa 1
		6.3 %	Fa 2

According to these figures the extreme Direct Method was not widespread in *fackskolan* in Sweden at the time of this survey. However, as with *grundskolan* there are some matters on which *fackskolan* teachers were divided approximately 50/50, so again a pupil's experience of language teaching would vary a great deal according to which class he happens to find himself in. The teaching points concerned are presented in Table IV:9.

Table IV:9 Approaches to Teaching Grammar and Vocabulary on which fackskolan Teachers Were Very Divided

Teaching technique	% of *fackskolan* teachers		Grade
(i) "memorisation of examples" to teach grammar:	NEVER/SELDOM	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS	
	57.1 %	42.9 %	Fa 2
(ii) "learning of definite rules" to teach grammar:			
	56.1 %	43.9 %	Fa 1
	51.5 %	48.5 %	Fa 2
(iii) explanation of grammar by a combination of English and Swedish:			
	45.9 %	54.1 %	Fa 1
	42.4 %	57.6 %	Fa 2
(iv) explanation of new vocabulary in English alone:			
	58.8 %	41.2 %	Fa 1
	45.4 %	54.6 %	Fa 2
(v) explanation of new vocabulary in Swedish alone:			
	53.5 %	46.5 %	Fa 1
	55.3 %	44.7 %	Fa 2

Again we must conclude that teachers must take their choice according to the particular group they are teaching but once the *grundskolan* stage has been passed then it would be reasonable to assume that Piaget's stage of formal operations has been reached by the majority of pupils and also that, according to Lenneberg, the hypothesised innate

language learning mechanism is no longer available to process new language information. One would infer therefore that the further up the time scale the pupils had progressed the more cognitive teaching could become. However, one must not forget Jensen's suggestion about two Levels of Intelligence and the thought that for those still at Level I an associative learning approach might be more helpful than one depending on conceptual abilities:

> "... an educational system that puts inordinate emphasis on only one mode or style of learning will obtain meager results from the children who do not fit this pattern. At present, I believe that the educational system ... operates in such a way as to maximize the importance of Level II (i.e. intelligence or *g*) as a source of variance in scholastic performance." (Jensen, 1972, p. 201)

Jensen is referring to the American educational system, but his words are a warning not to attempt to fit all pupils into a Procrustean model of learning. The problem for teachers of English is therefore not only what methods they prefer themselves or what method some expert prescribes for them or indeed what method will suit a class as a whole. The problem is: what combination of methods will suit particular individual pupils.

Matching of Experts' Definition with Teachers' Perception of Teaching Methods

4) *gymnasium*

a) teaching time allotted to various practices: nearest approach is EC

b) teaching grammar:

(i) for the 12.8 %–17.0 % who often did *not* give a rule with a pattern practice: either LEDM or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 83.0 %–87.2 % who often gave rules with pattern practices: either EC or G/T or MDM (for the latter depending on expert consulted)

(ii) for the 75.8 %–88.0 % who gave a rule as a summing up/conclusion to pattern practices: either MDM or EC;
for the 12.0 %–24.2 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T

(iii) for the 52.0 %–58.0 % who seldom used the method "memorisation of grammatical examples": LEDM or MDM or EC (depending on the expert consulted for the last two);
for the 42.0 %–48.0 % who often used this method: either MDM or EC (both depending on the expert consulted) or G/T

(iv) for the 44.6 %–56.2 % who seldom used the method of "learning definite rules": either LEDM or MDM or EC (for the latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 43.8 %–55.4 % who often used this method: either EC (depending on expert consulted) or G/T

(v) for the 57.9 %–76.2 % who seldom taught grammar by means of a systematic study of the grammar book: either LEDM or MDM or EC (the latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 23.8 %–42.1 % who often taught grammar this way: either EC (depending on expert consulted) or G/T

(vi) for the 86.3 %–94.6 % who often taught grammar in connection with the text being studied: either MDM or EC or G/T or LEDM (the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 5.4 %–13.7 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T (in both cases depending on the expert consulted)

c) use of native language

(i) for the 53.1 %–67.3 % who often explained grammar in Swedish alone: either G/T or MDM or EC (the two latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 32.7 %–46.9 % who seldom explained grammar in Swedish alone: either LEDM or MDM or EC (the last two depending on the expert consulted);
for the 40.7 %–49.0 % who seldom used a combination of English and Swedish to explain grammar: either LEDM or G/T;
for the 51.0 %–59.3 % who often used a combination of English and Swedish to explain grammar: either MDM or EC;
for the 54.7 %–72.0 % who seldom explained grammar in English alone: either EC or G/T or MDM (for the latter depending on the expert consulted);
for the 28.0 %–45.3 % who often explained grammar in English alone: either LEDM or MDM (latter depending on which expert consulted)

(ii) for the 33.8 %–39.3 % who often explained new vocabulary in Swedish alone: either G/T or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 60.7 %–66.2 % who seldom explained new vocabulary in Swedish alone: either LEDM or MDM or EC (latter depending on expert consulted);
for the 75.8 %–76.6 % who often used a combination of English and Swedish to explain new vocabulary: MDM or EC;
for the 23.4 %–24.2 % who seldom did this: either LEDM or G/T;
for the 27.5 %–38.6 % who seldom used English alone to explain new vocabulary: either EC or G/T;
for the 61.4 %–72.5 % who often used English alone to explain new vocabulary: either LEDM or MDM.

With these figures in mind it is then necessary to see what proportions took up an extreme position of the "Never" and "Nearly Always" type. Table IV:10 gives the proportions of teachers at the *gymnasium* level who can be referred to the LEDM approach.

Table IV:10 Percentages of Teachers in gymnasium with an LEDM Approach

Teaching technique	% of *gymnasium* teachers		Grade
a) Grammar			
(i) Practice without giving a rule	NEARLY ALWAYS	1.4 %	Gy 1
		1.8 %	Gy 2
		1.9 %	Gy 3
(ii) Pattern practice with a rule as summing up	NEVER	1.2 %	Gy 1
		1.2 %	Gy 2
		4.9 %	Gy 3
b) Use of Swedish alone:			
(i) for grammatical explanations	NEVER	5.4 %	Gy 1
		8.9 %	Gy 2
		11.3 %	Gy 3
(ii) for vocabulary explanations	NEVER	5.1 %	Gy 1
		5.9 %	Gy 2
		7.3 %	Gy 3
c) Use of English alone:			
(i) for grammatical explanations	NEARLY ALWAYS	4.6 %	Gy 1
		5.7 %	Gy 2
		13.6 %	Gy 3
(ii) for vocabulary explanations	NEARLY ALWAYS	10.5 %	Gy 1
		12.7 %	Gy 2
		17.3 %	Gy 3

These figures indicate that the extreme Direct Method was not widespread in *gymnasium* at the time of this survey.

This supports the conclusion reached by Eriksson in his school inspector's report where he says:

> "After a year as an inspector of English in *gymnasium* . . . I have not witnessed any pure direct method teaching during this whole period and I doubt if it exists. Translation is used in general when considered necessary and grammar rules and explanations – often in Swedish – are not uncommon. This (way of teaching) is naturally fully supported by the curriculum plan. Teaching certainly can be more or less unilingual, but only in exceptional cases have I noticed that an extreme use of unilingualism has caused difficulties for the pupils." (My translation. Eriksson, 1971, p. 2)

In Eriksson's opinion the Language Controversy was misdirected from the beginning and there are no pure direct method teachers in Sweden (personal communication, 1973). The conclusions reached from this survey would seem to support the view that "pure" or "extreme" direct method teaching is practised by very few teachers, although again it must be pointed out that in *gymnasium*, too, teachers are divided 50/50 in their approach to some aspects of teaching. The teaching points concerned are given in Table IV:11.

Table IV:11 Approaches to Teaching Grammar on which gymnasium Teachers Were Very Divided

Teaching technique	% of *gymnasium* teachers		Grade
(i) "memorisation of examples" to teach grammar:	NEVER/SELDOM	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS	
	52.0 %	48.0 %	Gy 1
	53.0 %	47.0 %	Gy 2
	58.0 %	42.0 %	Gy 3
(ii) "learning of definite rules" to teach grammar:			
	44.6 %	55.4 %	Gy 1
	45.8 %	54.2 %	Gy 2
	56.2 %	43.8 %	Gy 3
(iii) use of a systematic study of the grammar book to teach grammar:			
	57.9 %	42.1 %	Gy 1
(iv) explanation of grammar in Swedish alone:			
	46.9 %	53.1 %	Gy 3
(v) explanation of grammar by a combination of English and Swedish:			
	40.7 %	59.3 %	Gy 1
	43.3 %	56.7 %	Gy 2
	49.0 %	51.0 %	Gy 3

It will be noted that the higher up the scale one goes in *gymnasium*, the more English was used for explanations, particularly of vocabulary, and it is in the third year of *gymnasium* that most English was used. This appears to correspond with Lado's view:

> ". . . if we use the first language every time any real communication is necessary, the target language will remain a useless curiosity, rather than the vital communication system it is." (Lado, 1964, p. 121)

Presumably, in the teachers' perception the more English the pupils know, the more can be used for explanatory purposes. It is also noteworthy that more teachers did "formal" grammar in Gy 1 than they did in Gy 3, and this may be a reflection of a perceived gap between the *grundskolan* system and the more academic and conceptual approach felt to

be necessary in *gymnasium*; the teachers in the first year of the *gymnasium* feeling that pupils coming from *grundskolan* need to study a grammar book.

Summing up:

The Language Controversy was about the use of the Direct Method and its results in pupils' achievement. This study supports the view that an LEDM approach was not used at that time at all widely and consistently by teachers in Swedish schools. The study also indicates that teaching practices at that time varied with age, type of course and grade level. The higher up the academic scale the pupils were (in *grundskolan*) the more English was used for explanation and the more "rules" were used in grammar teaching. In *fackskolan* more teachers tended *not* to give rules, compared to 9 sär, though these teachers were a minority, and also fewer teachers in *fackskolan* tended to a "formal" grammar approach than in 9 sär. Swedish for explanations was used by more teachers in *fackskolan* than in 9 sär. In fact, the approach of most teachers in *fackskolan* corresponded to the approach of most teachers in *grundskolan allmän* courses, rather than to the majority of teachers of *grundskolan särskild* courses. This is hardly surprising in view of the fact that the students came from *allmän* courses in *grundskolan.* The approach of most teachers at the *gymnasium* level corresponded more closely to the approach of the majority of teachers in *grundskolan särskild* courses than to those teaching *allmän* courses. However, there was a tendency for more teachers to use English for explanations in *gymnasium* as compared to 9 sär, but this was only marked in Gy 3.

As far as the teaching of grammar is concerned, the teachers at the *gymnasium* level divided almost 50/50 on the question of how much to use a "formal" grammar approach and this division was well-represented in the Language Controversy. It is suggested: (a) that the fact that for most teachers in *gymnasium*, grammar is taught in connection with the text being studied is a major factor in "the randomness in the study of grammar" noted by Eriksson and (b) that text material at this level should contain a more systematic progression of grammatical structures. It is felt by this author that the incorporation of such a system in the material to be studied (Eriksson, 1971; Danielsson, 1972) would go a long way towards giving the thoroughness desired in English teaching at the *gymnasium* level without a return to an overemphasis on grammar/translation which none of the main disputants in the Language Controversy seems to want (Ellegård & Lindell, 1970, p. 81). It would also have the effect of lessening the number of attitude statements about teaching method. This is not to say, however, that the teaching profession in Sweden did not have good cause for unease but the reasons are to seek not in the symbolic protest about use of a direct method; it is far more likely they were grounded in the profession's uneasiness about its situation in general.

Chapter V

DEVELOPMENT OF THE IEA COGNITIVE TESTS

Having discussed the methods used in teaching English in Swedish schools at the time of this inquiry, it is of interest to report and analyse the results achieved by these methods. However, in order to be able to do this a short description of the achievement tests themselves is necessary. This is the purpose of this chapter; the results achieved by Swedish students will then be presented and discussed in succeeding chapters.

Rationale for the Construction of the IEA Tests

(1) With so many countries to take into account, it was not possible to base the tests on a contrastive analysis of the various mother tongues and English as apart from the inordinate length of time such tests would take to prepare, the tests would not then provide the basis needed for comparison of achievement as between countries.

(2) The National Committee in each country was asked which variety of English they would prefer to have tested: American or English. The National Committees decided in favour of British English and this was adopted accordingly as the language for the tests.

(3) Because of the number of participating countries and their different criteria for selection of vocabulary and structures for teaching purposes, it was not possible to select the vocabulary and structures to be tested at each level by reference to any one country's system of selection as this would have placed the other countries at a disadvantage. Further, there is no internationally recognised body of structures or vocabulary for English (as there is in Français Fondamentale), which can be used as a standard to measure achievement at certain levels.

The Committee therefore decided to work pragmatically, using the broad experience of the International Committee corrected by the feedback from National Centres, in order to select the structures and vocabulary to be tested. Moreover, as the number of structures and the amount of vocabulary would in any case have to be limited (as neither every structure nor every word taught at each level could be tested in the time available) a sample of structures and vocabulary would in any case have to be selected and the feedback from the pre-testing of a large number of items was then used to help finalise the sample of vocabulary and structures included in the final test instruments.

(4) In order to obtain an overall picture of countries' achievement, it was decided to test the four skills:

Reading Comprehension
Listening Comprehension
Writing Comprehension
Speech Production

These four main headings were then divided into sub-sections as can be seen from the brief description of the tests given later in this chapter.

(5) The difficulties of securing exact equivalence as between countries in a passage to be translated from the mother tongue caused the Committee to exclude the possibility of translation in the tests. It was decided to use the mother tongue in the tests only

(a) for the test instructions and (b) for the Listening Comprehension multiple choice alternatives at the Population II level.

(6) In order to avoid cultural bias as between countries and continents, it was felt that as far as possible the content of the tests should not reflect an intimate knowledge of English or American life but should reflect a common cultural basis, that necessary to achieve ordinary communication. In spite of this hope, however, the choice of, for example, Reading Passages for Comprehension must necessarily reflect a more Western than Eastern culture.

(7) In order to make certain that lower-achieving countries would not find the Population IV Tests impossibly difficult, it was decided to include a number of Population II items in the Population IV tests. In some of the tests this meant that the top range of ability was not sufficiently catered for, but it should be remembered that the Production Tests in Speaking Fluency and Writing (Composition) gave the more able pupils the chance to show their ability. Further, optional National Additional Tests were allowed, if countries wished to arrange them, so that further studies with additional items (in, for example, Listening Comprehension) were possible.

(8) As far as the format of the tests was concerned it was decided to use Multiple Choice questions to test Comprehension and Open-Ended questions to test production following the reasoning that comprehension can be tested by Recognition but that Production necessarily requires further or other motor responses.

A full description of the IEA English tests, both cognitive and affective, will be found in Lewis & Massad (1975).

Background to the construction of the cognitive tests

At the time when the IEA tests were constructed there were not a great many complete batteries of cognitive tests for English as a Foreign Language in existence. For example, "The Diagnostic Test for Students of English as a Second Language" (Davis H. L., 1953) tested ability in the use of pronouns, nouns, adjectives and adverbs, prepositions, word order, verbs, modals, tenses and voices and idiomatic vocabulary. It did not test production but recognition skills. "An English Reading Test for Students of English as a Foreign Language" (King & Campbell, 1956) was a thirty minute reading comprehension test designed to determine whether students had sufficient reading ability to enter an American college. Again, by definition, this did not include production. The Lado Test, "English Language Test for Foreign Students" (1951), sampled functional use of the sounds, structure and words of English and was again recognition rather than production. In addition, the Michigan University English Language Institute had produced "Examination in Structure", "Test of Aural Comprehension" and "Test of Aural Perception for Latin American Students". "The English Language Institute, Ann Arbor, Michigan constructs fairly pure achievement tests for their own internal purposes: to assess the standing and progress of the foreign students who are taught at the Institute. They also construct and run the Michigan Proficiency Test of English as a Foreign Language. This is a proficiency test which is used to answer questions such as: Does this individual command enough English to enter on his studies at the University of Michigan (or other universities) without doing additional courses in English? If not how much teaching should he have first? " (Ingram in Davies, 1968, p. 72)

In addition to the above there were the McCallien "Examination Tests in Oral English" (Longman, 1958) and "The English Proficiency Test Battery" (Davies. Not published until after the IEA tests had been pre-tested) and "The English Language Battery" (Ingram. Not published until after the IEA tests had been pre-tested). However, items from the Davies test battery are exemplified in Pilliner (in Davies, 1968) and a critique of

the McCallien Test is given in Davies (1968, Ch. 10). The McCallien Test in fact is more a test of production than anything else and it obtains that production by asking the candidates

a) to read aloud
b) to prepare short sentences themselves which they then read aloud
c) to make up and say a sentence containing a word previously said by the examiner
d) to spell a word said by the examiner
e) to say the stressed words in a sentence read aloud by the examiner
f) to hold a 3–5 minute conversation with the examiner

The test also includes asking the candidate to identify the meaning of sentences with marked stress and with fall-rise intonation. Again, though this is comprehension as the candidate explains the meaning of the sentences read to him in this way, as he uses English in his explanation this test, too, involves production.

The Princeton Educational Testing Service had, in addition, in 1964 produced the TOEFL tests (Tests in English as a Foreign Language) and the International Committee asked National Committees to examine these particularly. They consisted of the following:

Listening Comprehension
English Structure
Vocabulary
Reading Comprehension
Writing Ability

All the tests were multiple choice and no production or open ended items were included. The Writing Ability tests were designed to test students' ability to recognise language appropriate to formal, written English and were therefore concerned with recognition of style or register.

In Sweden, testing changed in the 1960's in accordance with the requirements of the new curriculum for the Swedish Compulsory School (Lgr 62) and the tests produced by the Stockholm School of Education for Grade 8 (SÖ–LHS Engelska alt. 2 Uppl. A:6, 1963) show that tests of reading comprehension by multiple choice questions had been accepted by then. Multiple choice questions had also been tried in the same test as tests of vocabulary using the following system:

Instruction: Mark the letter you believe is the first one in the word that has been left out. First check that the number of letters agrees with the number of stars (My translation)

Example: We sleep in a *** M K R B L

These tests were the prototypes for *standardproven* (Standard Tests) in the Swedish Compulsory School together with a Listening Comprehension Test recorded on tape where again multiple choice alternatives were given. No form of Written or Spoken production was included in these tests.

At the *gymnasium* level the National Board of Education had, in the 1960's, designed Central Tests for the second form of the three year *gymnasium*. These tests consisted of:

Listening comprehension (with multiple choice questions)
Reading comprehension (with multiple choice questions)
A vocabulary test (with multiple choice questions)
An essay as a test of written production

The prototypes of these tests were produced in 1966 and tested during the Spring of 1967 and the revised tests administered for the first time in December 1967. No test of speech production was included in this battery though it was stated:

> "No test of speech production has yet been developed but this is regarded as a most welcome task to be undertaken during the next few years." (My translation. Rönnberg, Report, National Board of Education, Bureau L 4:1, 7.9.1966)

At the time of writing no such Central Test of Speech Production has been produced for use in the *gymnasium* in Sweden, although a Structure Test has now been added to the test battery for this level. The same interest in the problem of producting tests of Speech Production was however shown at meetings arranged in Stockholm during the early part of 1967 in connection with the Nordic Summer Universities' Programme (Nordiska sommaruniversitetet, 1967).

The minutes of the summer session (1967) of the Nordic Summer Universities Group 3 which dealt with "The Measurement of Language Skills", state:

> "The conference produced the strong impression that an experimentally tested test of speech production, possible to use in actual teaching situations, was lacking." (My translation)

From the above brief description it will be seen that the major difficulty in constructing a test battery to test all four skills (Listening, Reading, Writing and Speech) would be in Production, particularly Speech Production. For whereas tests had been constructed in phoneme discrimination in certain tests in listening, there was no adequate testing procedure for testing suprasegmental and segmental features in the stream of speech except for reading aloud. Moreover, for the actual production of speech the Committee had to work with special methods for testing structural control and fluency; and in connection with the latter design scoring schemes. (See *infra* under "Scoring".)

For written production it was necessary to consider if multiple choice items on the lines of the TOEFL test of writing ability would suffice and the International Committee decided that giving choices was more a test of recognition than of production and that therefore all tests of writing production (as well as speech production) should be open-ended. By doing this, the Committee endorsed the opinion that the "response of recognition is different from that of spontaneous construction" (Borger & Seaborne, 1966, p. 212). Moreover, the scoring of "free writing" has always been a matter for discussion (e.g. Cast, 1939; Wiseman, 1949; Finlayson, 1951; Ebel, 1965; Newberry, 1967). Again, the International Committee had to make decisions as to scoring procedure for the "Fluency" test, and these are reported below.

Pre-testing

"Pre-testing took place in each of the participating countries. Approximately 150 students took part in the pre-testing program in each country and every country sampled tests of Reading, Listening, Speaking and Writing". (Lewis & Massad, 1975 p. 37)

In Sweden, approximately 2,150 students took part in English pre-testing, differing sub-tests being administered to varying sub-groups.

At the Population II level a total of 202 items and at the Population IV level a total of 288 items were pre-tested. The items were then selected for the final form of the test according to their difficulty and discriminating power using $r$pbis correlations between the item and the total test as indices of discrimination.

The Test Battery

The Test Battery which was finally constructed consisted of items of the type given below. It should be noted that the items given below did not actually appear in the test but are faithful reproductions of the different types of items that were administered in the test. Test timing is included for each section.

EXAMPLES OF *TYPES* OF ITEMS

RECOGNITION READING — Population II

TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS: 60 Time allowed: 60 minutes

Section I: Recognition of Antonyms No. of items: 6 For example: The weather was *lovely* yesterday

A. delightful
B. dreadful
C. very good
D. superb
E. quite nice

Section II: Letter-Sound Correspondences No. of items: 8 For example: Which word contains the same sound as the underlined letter?

h<u>a</u>t

A. cup
B. harp
C. name
D. balm
E. sand

Section III: Recognition of Structural Features No. of items: 10 For example: The police . . . . . here now

A. is
B. are
C. was

Section IV: Vocabulary Recognition No. of items: 6 For example: She is my *aunt*

A. mother's sister
B. father's daughter
C. sister's daughter

Section V: Reading Comprehension Short sentences No. of items: 14 For example: These gloves are too small

A. They are not big enough
B. They are just right
C. They are small enough

Section VI: Reading Comprehension – Short Reading Passages. Four passages, four questions on each No. of items: 16

RECOGNITION — Population II

LISTENING — TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS: 36 Time allowed: 30 minutes

Section I: Discrimination of Sounds No. of items: 12 For example:

THEY SEE: picture of a man — A. B. C.

THEY HEAR: men man moon

THEY MARK: A or B or C

Section II: Listening Comprehension Sentences or Short Paragraphs No. of items: 12 For example:

THEY SEE;

A. John köpte en bil förra veckan
B. John köpte en ko igår
C. John köpte en bil igår

THEY HEAR:

I heard yesterday that John bought a car last week.

THEY MARK: A, B or C

Section III: Dictation Passage of 10 lines Counted as: 12 items

PRODUCTION — Population II

WRITING — TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS: 31 (in Sections 1, 2 and 3)

Time allowed: 40 minutes (including composition)

Sections I & II: Tenses and Structures No. of items: 23 For example: open-ended items of this type (with instructions to fill in the missing word):

He is going to England _____ plane next week.
week.

Section III: Word Order No. of items: 8 Multiple choice For example:

George is a _____ _____ _____.

1. boy
2. short
3. with curly hair

Answer:

A. (1), (3), (2)
B. (2), (1), (3)
C. (2), (3), (1)
D. (3), (1), (2)
E. (3), (2), (1)

Section IV: Composition of 200 words with guidelines consisting of 12 words to do with the subject given, all of which had to be used in the composition

PRODUCTION Population II

SPEAKING

Section I: Structural Control No. of items: 10 Time allowed: 1 minute per pupil

THEY SEE: (for example) | picture of a man swimming |

THEY HEAR: What's he doing? (on tape)

THEY REPLY.

Pupils told to include both subject and verb in each answer. Their replies recorded on tape for scoring.

Section II: Oral Reading No. of items: 30 Time allowed per pupil: 3 minutes + reading time

Pupils given three minutes to prepare six line passage of English. Then each reads passage aloud and voice recorded on tape for scoring.
25 individual phonemes tested in the stream of speech and 5 breath groups tested for being said as a unit e.g. "What do you think? "

Section III: Fluency Time allowed 2 minutes + speaking time per pupil:

Pupils given two sets of pictures, each set consisting of three pictures telling a consecutive story. Pupils instructed that they have two minutes to make a choice as to which set of pictures to describe. Each pupil's response recorded on tape for scoring.

RECOGNITION Population IV

READING TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS: 60 Time allowed: 60 minutes

Section I: Recognition of Word Stress No. of items: 8 For example:

(i) de-clare
(ii) a-rouse
(iii) non-sense

Pupils mark correct alternative:

A. (i) and (ii) are the same
B. (i) and (iii) are the same
C. (ii) and (iii) are the same
D. all are the same
E. none are the same

Section II: Collocations No. of items: 8 For example:

Kind

A. voice
B. behaviour
C. man
D. building
E. tone

Pupils mark which noun cannot be used with the adjective given.

Section III: Recognition of Grammatical Structures No. of items: 8 For example:

They rang him up after . . . . . his picture in the papers

A. saw
B. to see
C. seeing

Pupils mark correct alternative.

Section IV: Reading Comprehension Short sentences of same type as for Population II No. of items: 11

Section V: Reading Comprehension Short reading passages 5 passages with 4–6 questions on each No. of items:25

RECOGNITION Population IV

LISTENING TOTAL NUMBERS OF ITEMS: 36 Time allowed: 30 minutes

Section I: Discrimination of sounds No. of items: 12 Exactly the same test as for Population II.

Section II: Recognition of Meaning through Intonation No. of items: 8 For example:

THEY SEE:	Vilka av de följande är frågor?	THEY HEAR: (on tape)
(första)	You're going out	You're going out!
(andra)	You're going out	You're going out?
(tredje)	You're going out	You're going out!

Pupils mark which of first, second and third examples they see was said as a question.

Section III: Listening Comprehension – Sentences or short paragraphs. No. of items: 8 For example:

THEY SEE:	THEY HEAR: (on tape)
A. George went out in the rain B. The weather was very bad all day C. The weather was going to change so George stayed in	It was a lovely day but George decided not to go out because he thought it was going to rain later

THEY MARK: alternative that refers correctly to the item.

Section IV: Listening Comprehension – Conversation No. of items: 8 For example:

THEY SEE:	THEY HEAR: (on tape)
A. Anne doesn't like TV B. Anne and Bill don't like TV C. Bill doesn't like TV	Bill: I don't like TV. It's so boring. Ann: Well, I must say I do.

THEY MARK: the statement that is correct.

PRODUCTION Population IV

WRITING TOTAL NUMBER OF ITEMS: 31 (in Parts 1, 2 and 3)
Time allowed: 40 minutes (including the Composition)

All writing items are identical in Population II and Population IV viz.

Section I and Section II: Tenses and Structures

Section III: Word Order

Section IV: Composition

PRODUCTION Population IV

SPEAKING

Sections I and II are identical with Population II

Section III A is identical with Population II; Section III B is new for Population IV

Section I: Structural Control
Section II: Oral Reading

Section III:
A. Describing one of two sets of pictures. Same pictures and same procedure as for Population II
B. In addition to A: pupils asked to describe one large picture. They were told that they would be scored on amount; accuracy and variety of vocabulary, tense and structure used. Each pupil's voice recorded for scoring.

———————

TESTING TIME: The total testing time taken for group administration of Listening, Reading and Writing was 130 minutes; while the Speaking Test allowed 30 minutes to administer each pupil separately.

"ANCHOR" ITEMS: In addition to the Writing Test and the Speaking Test (Sections I and II and Fluency A) and Listening Section I, there are 16 items in the Reading Tests that are identical for the two populations.

At this point some discussion of testing may be relevant. Many authorities in language testing (e.g. Wood, 1960; Lado, 1961; Valette, 1967; Davies, 1968) agree that in language testing the important considerations are:

Validity
Reliability
Administrative feasibility; and
"Backwash" effect on teaching.

This last point is particularly emphasised in Wilkinson/Davies/Atkinson (1965) and is stressed again in Davies (1968):

> "A good educational test, it is axiomatic to say, will always (and should) influence the teaching for which it serves as a goal and as a sample of terminal behaviour." (Davies op.cit., p. 155)

Reliability will be dealt with when discussing the result of each test and Validity in outline, below, as well as the "backwash" effect.

Validity

Davies (1968) gives the following diagram for validity:

Diagram V:I Types of Validity

Type	related to	Criterion
Face		Lay view of language
Content		Syllabus analysis
Construct		Theory of aims in Language Teaching
Predictive		Later test of language ability
Concurrent		Another test or measure (e.g. teacher's assessment) of language ability given at same time

Source: Davies, 1968, Table 1, p. 9.

Face Validity

"Face validity. This may appear trivial since it refers to acceptance by the layman. But in education it is often important to show as well as know what is being done is relevant. Face validity may therefore not be so trivial after all." (Davies, op.cit., p. 9)

Presumably, face validity asks: "If my son/daughter has done well on these tests does this mean that he/she can speak/write/understand English pretty well? " To answer this means asking the questions:

(a) how old is the child?
(b) what sort of situations will the child have to function in, in English?

When reviewing the items in the tests for the Population II level one must also add:

(c) has the child already received enough good basic training in English to be able to continue studying English with profit or does my child need remedial work before going on with English?
(d) has the school system taught the child what it set out to teach him/her?

These are questions of Content Validity and Construct Validity.

Construct Validity

If by construct validity we mean how well has a child's school English equipped him for life, then these tests cannot answer that question fully because they are not designed to test task performance i.e. the ability to perform in certain specified situations. To take one type of situation, the Everyday Situation (shopping, eating at a restaurant i.e. "tourist" situations in general), these tests are not designed to test this. Nor are they designed to test, for example, the ability to write business letters. The tests are designed to test general English language abilities. That is: command of grammatical structures, pronunciation of certain sounds, speaking with fluency etc., as can be seen from the description above and below.

Content Validity

"In foreign language testing there is no substitute for content analysis" (Lado, 1961, p. 343)

Since these tests were designed to be administered in countries with differing linguistic backgrounds, the question must be asked as to how valid they are for the Swedish school system?

To answer this we must analyse the Swedish curriculum in English at different levels and see if the tests measure what the schools are supposed to teach in English. The following gives such an analysis and compares it with the content of the IEA Tests at the Population II level. It should be remembered that Population II included pupils from Grades 7 and 8 in *grundskolan* and from both *allmän* courses and *särskild* courses.

The following shows (in my translation) the aims and detailed plans for Grades 7, 8 and 9 as expressed in the Curriculum Plan for *grundskolan* (Lgr 62) at the time the tests were administered and matches the Curriculum Plan with the IEA Tests:

Curriculum Plan	*IEA Population II Tests*	
1) Aims:		
a) The four skills given in order of importance:		
(i) understand clear speech	Listening:	Section I: discrimination of sounds Section II: listening comprehension Section III: dictation
	Reading:	Section II: letter-sound correspondences
(ii) read and understand easy texts	Reading:	Section V: short sentences Section VI: continuous passages

(iii) express oneself in speech in simple, everyday situations	Speaking:	Sections I, II and III (but see: Construct validity *supra*)
(iv) to some degree to be able to express oneself in writing	Listening:	Section III: Dictation
	Writing:	Sections I, II, and IV

The next comparison goes into more detail as regards vocabulary, grammar and pronunciation:

NOTE: in the following, + marks those items in the curriculum plan which are *not* included in the IEA test battery

Curriculum plan	*IEA Population II Tests*	
2) General goal:		
(i) to teach pupils a limited central vocabulary of words and phrases	Reading:	Section I: Antonyms Section IV: Vocabulary
(ii) to teach pupils a limited central stock of grammatical patterns, the following grammar being suggested:		
definite+ and indefinite+ article	Writing:	Section III: Item 16
plurals of nouns (including some irregular plurals)		
Number (nouns in Swedish which have different number in English)	Reading:	Section III: Item 15
the genitive+		
comparison and superlative of adjectives (both regular and irregular)+		
numbers+		
pronouns: personal pronouns (in Swedish terminology "pronouns" also includes: There is/are)	Writing:	Section II: Item 15
	Speaking:	Section I: Item 4
personal pronouns as objects+		
possessive pronouns	Writing:	Section II: Item 14
	Reading:	Section III: Item 16
interrogative pronouns+		
demonstrative pronouns and adjectives	Writing:	Section III: Item 17
relative pronouns	Writing:	Section I: Item 13
	Reading:	Section III: Item 22
indefinite pronouns+		
reflexive pronouns	Writing:	Section I: Item 10
determinative pronouns+		
possessive adjectives+		
adverbs: formation and use	Writing:	Section 1: Items 4 & 5

adjective + noun+ (where Swedish uses a nominalised adjective)	NOTE:	opposite use, where English uses a nominalised adjective:
	Reading:	Section III: Item 23
Tenses:		
simple present	Speaking:	Section I: Items 3, 7 8 & 10
	Reading:	Section III: Item 19
	Writing:	Section I: Items 8 & 9
present continuous	Speaking:	Section I: Item 2
	Writing:	Section II: Item 18
simple past (regular and irregular)	Speaking:	Section I: Item 5
	Writing:	Section II: Items 19 & 20
past continuous	Speaking:	Section I: Item 6
	Writing:	Section II: Item 21
present perfect (regular and irregular)	Speaking:	Section I: Item 8
conditional	Writing:	Section I: Item 11
pluperfect+		
the future+		
anomalous finites+		
the infinitive+ without "to"		
the infinitive with "to"	Reading:	Section III: Item 21
	Writing:	Section I: Item 2
Voice: the passive	Writing:	Section II: Items 22 & 23
the gerund+		
prepositions	Reading:	Section III: Items 17, 18, 20
	Writing:	Section I: Items 1, 3 & 12
		Section II: Item 22
conjunctions	Writing:	Section I: Item 6
word order	Reading:	Section III: Item 24
	Writing:	Section III: Items 24–31
(iii) *Pronunciation*		
a) to lay the foundations of good pronunciation	Listening:	Section I: discrimination of sounds. Items 1–12
	Reading:	Section II: letter-sound correspondences. Items 7–14
	Speaking:	Section II: oral reading. 30 items.
b) to use Southern Standard English pronunciation as a model	the tests for listening and speaking were recorded in RP (Received Pronunciation)	

As can be seen from the above the main aims of the curriculum plan for the Swedish Compulsory School are covered in the IEA tests, although again note the doubts expressed about construct validity in relation to "simple, everyday situations." As far as grammar is concerned, 16 of the phenomena desiderated in the curriculum have not been included in the IEA tests, but 20 have been included, In addition, there is one item included which is not specifically mentioned in the Swedish curriculum (See "nominalised adjective" above).

As far as Population II is concerned therefore it can be said that the IEA tests have reasonable content validity for Sweden. The situation is, however, somewhat different for

Population IV as it is not possible to give a detailed list of grammar points from the curriculum plans for *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* and compare these with the IEA tests, as such lists do not exist. One can only therefore list the aspects of language covered in the Population IV tests, and then discuss the validity of the tests as a whole.

Grammar, vocabulary and pronunciation points included in the IEA Population IV Tests	*Test in which included*
a) grammar:	
the gerund, infinitive with and without "to", prepositions, conjunctions, adjectives used as nouns, word order, plurals of nouns, personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, demonstrative pronouns and adjectives, relative pronouns, reflexive pronouns, adverbs, Tenses: simple present, present continuous, simple past, past continuous, present perfect, conditional Voice: the passive	Reading: Section III and Speaking: Section I and Writing: Section I, II and III
b) vocabulary:	
collocations	Reading: Section II
c) pronunciation:	
phoneme discrimination	Listening: Section I
word stress	Reading: Section I
intonation	Listening: Section II
segmental and supra-segmental pronunciation	Speaking: Sections II and III

In addition, for Listening Comprehension there are the tests on short passages and on conversation; for Speech Production there are the Fluency tests; and for Reading Comprehension there are the reading passages. The difficulty of these tests must be a matter of subjective judgement but the tests of Fluency and Written Production (Composition) must have both good face validity and content validity and their construct validity also seems high except, again, as far as dealing with "everyday" situations is concerned. The reading passages, including as they do, a final passage on political philosophy, also have high face, content and construct validity. Listening Comprehension, however, (subjectively) did not seem difficult enough to test knowledge of varieties of spoken English and for this reason a special sample at the Population IV level (*gymnasium* only) was given a specially constructed Listening Comprehension test *(infra)*. It is hoped that the "backwash" effect will be beneficial in influencing tests of listening comprehension away from being memory tests and towards being more in the nature of "task performance". As this special Listening Comprehension Test was given as a National Option for Sweden and was therefore not administered in other countries, a description of this special test and its outcomes is given in Chapter VII.

Reliability

All the reliabilities reported in Tables V:1 to V:3 (inclusive) were arrived at by means of Kuder-Richardson Formula 20.

Table V:1 Reliabilities for Reading Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population II

Contry	Total Test	Sub-scores in Order of Sections					
		I	II	III	IV	V	VI
Belgium (Fr.)	.91	.50	.63	.45	.58	.78	.80
FRG	.93	.56	.67	.51	.62	.78	.82
Finland	.93	.64	.72	.57	.62	.77	.79
Israel	.95	.73	.69	.62	.74	.83	.88
Italy	.94	.71	.71	.68	.70	.80	.86
Netherlands	.94	.69	.73	.66	.71	.77	.83
Sweden	.93	.58	.66	.52	.66	.76	.80
Thailand	.87	.53	.52	.59	.59	.65	.70
Number of Items	60	6	8	10	6	14	16

Sub-scores:
Section I Recognition of Antonyms
Section II Letter-Sound Correspondence
Section III Recognition of Structural Features
Section IV Vocabulary Recognition
Section V Comprehension of Short Sentences
Section VI Comprehension of Longer Passages

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 3.7

The reliabilities for Population II for the total reading test (Table V:1) are most satisfactory for all countries and although the reliabilities for the sub-tests are much lower because of the small number of items in each sub-tests, it will be noted that the reliabilities for Reading Comprehension of Longer Passages are all reasonably high. Since the tests are used for group comparisons even reliabilities round .50 to .70 are satisfactory.

Table V:2 Reliabilities for Listening Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population II

Country	Total Test	Sub-scores in Order of Sections	
		I	II
Belgium (Fr.)	.93	.50	.64
Finland	.96	.44	.71
Italy	.83	.59	.77
Sweden	.95	.35	.64
Number of Items	24	12	12

Sub-scores:
Section I Discrimination of Sounds
Section II Listening Comprehension

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 3.5

The reliabilities in Population II for Total Listening (Table V:2) are, again, satisfactory.

Table V:3 Reliabilities for Reading Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population IV

Country	Total Test	Sub-scores in Order of Sections				
		I	II	III	IV	V
Belgium (Fr.)	.86	.40	.46	.41	.58	.82
Chile	.85	.41	.34	.29	.58	.81
FRG	.68	.49	.31	.27	.17	.57
Finland	.78	.51	.39	.33	.28	.72
Hungary	.85	.44	.52	.57	.51	.77
Israel	.91	.58	.59	.56	.66	.87
Italy	.90	.55	.59	.41	.61	.90
Netherlands	.69	.59	.24	.39	.14	.59
Sweden	.84	.66	.26	.46	.41	.79
Thailand	.76	.17	.17	.47	.46	.66
Number of Items	60	8	8	8	11	25

Sub-scores:

Section I	Recognition of Word Stress
Section II	Collocations
Section III	Recognition of Grammatical Structures
Section IV	Comprehension of Short Sentences
Section V	Comprehension of Longer Passages

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 3.8

The reliabilities in Population IV for Total Reading are satisfactory in most countries, although not particularly good in Germany and the Netherlands (Table V:3). This is also reflected in the sub-score for Reading Comprehension Longer Passages. However, the reliabilities for Total Reading are not as uniformly high for all countries as in Population II Reading nor are they as high in Population IV sub-tests as for Population II. It should be kept in mind that Population IV in many countries is a select group with a much lower spread of performance than at levels where one hundred per cent of the age group is still at school. The reliability for Total Reading as far as Sweden is concerned, however, is again satisfactory.

Table V:4 Reliabilities for Listening Total Test and Sub-Scores, Population IV

Country	Total Test	Sub-scores in Order of Sections			
		I	II	III	IV
Belgium (Fr.)	.76	.49	.55	.55	.53
Chile	.67	.42	.56	.27	.12
Finland	.71	.38	.51	.50	.52
Hungary	.75	.52	.45	.54	.54
Italy	.84	.50	.48	.55	.62
Sweden	.78	.32	.50	.46	.52
Number of Items	36	12	8	8	8

Sub-scores:

Section I	Discrimination of Sounds
Section II	Meaning through Intonation
Section III	Listening Comprehension
Section IV	Listening Comprehension (Conversation)

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 3.6

The reliabilities in Population IV are lower than for Population II Listening and the sub-score reliabilities are naturally lower than those for the whole test. Chile's very low

sub-score reliabilities are probably a reflection of the very low mean scores achieved in part tests by that country. The reliability of the Total Listening Test for Sweden is, again, satisfactory.

It will be noted from the above that not all countries took all tests. This will be commented on in Chapter VI. The Recognition Tests reported on above appear to be of satisfactory reliability and the Production Tests (of Speaking and Writing) with their Scoring Systems and Inter-Rater Reliability will be reported on in Chapter VI.

"Backwash" effect

The "backwash" effects of the IEA Tests can only be judged at this moment of time subjectively. However, the decision of the International Committee to make a distinction between Recognition and Production will perhaps have some effect in underlining the distinction between these two modes of performance. It can be hoped, too, that the Committee's decision to test Recognition by multiple choice questions and Production by open-ended questions will have the agreeable "backwash" effect of helping both teachers and educational administrators to realise that because one recognises the difference between right and wrong, it does not necessarily mean that one will always be able to produce the right response when called upon to do so.

In conclusion, it is hoped that this chapter has presented sufficient evidence to show that the cognitive instruments have sufficient content validity and are satisfactorily reliable to be used, together with the Special Listening Comprehension Test presented in Chapter VII, as adequate instruments for the evaluation of the outcomes of teaching English in Swedish schools.

Chapter VI

ACHIEVEMENT OF SWEDISH STUDENTS

The purpose of studying achievement in English in Swedish schools in an international perspective is to see if the methods used by Swedish schoolteachers, at the time of this inquiry, had resulted in a low or a high standard of English for Swedish students compared to those of other countries. Hence the use of the IEA cognitive tests for this purpose so that an international comparison could be made. The second use of these tests was to try and establish how far the methods used for teaching English in Swedish schools had resulted in the aims of the Curriculum Plans being fulfilled. Before discussing these outcomes, however, it is necessary briefly to establish the numbers and categories of students to which the tests were administered.

For comparisons with other countries only the Population II and Population IV levels can be considered. No distinction is made in these results for Sweden between *allmän* and *särskild* course pupils in Grades 7 and 8 in *grundskolan*; nor between Grade 7 and 8 results; nor between *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* results.

Table VI:1 N's for Participation in the IEA English as a Foreign Language Study

	Belgium (Fr.)	Chile	FRG	Finland	Hungary	Israel	Italy	Netherlands	Sweden	Thailand
Population II										
Schools	42	–	47	71	–	44	62	91	97	40
Teachers	105	–	248	187	–	70	126	146	492	310
Students	725	–	1110	2164	–	1096	809	2098	2454	1957
Population IV										
Schools	54	80	59	73	46	20	18	52	81	15
Teachers	174	265	360	299	118	52	37	64	503	142
Students	1485	2314	1379	2369	1063	614	329	1568	1767	936

Note that this table contains unweighted numbers; that is, the number refers to the actual number of cases occurring in a sample.
Dashes (–) indicate that no sample was represented.
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 2.3

International comparisons of outcomes of cognitive tests

A) POPULATION II

(i) Reading

Table VI:2 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Reading Total Test, Population II

Country	Total Test		
	Mean	S.D.	N
Belgium (Fr.)	22.8	15.2	687
FRG	29.9	16.2	1074
Finland	16.7	17.8	2100
Israel	26.3	18.7	1065
Italy	18.6	17.3	791
Netherlands	37.4	16.4	2090
Sweden	35.0	14.9	2322
Thailand	18.4	13.4	1951
Number of Items	60		

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.1

It can be seen in Total Reading that the rank order of countries is: the Netherlands, Sweden, the Federal Republic of Germany, Israel, Belgium (Fr.), Italy, Thailand, Finland. The average mark achieved by Swedish Population II pupils was 58.3 %. It is of interest to see, too, in which parts of the Reading Test Swedish pupils performed well or not by examining the various sub-scores, shown in Table VI:3.

Table VI:3 Means and Standard Deviations for Reading Sub-scores, Population II

Country	Sub-Scores in Order of Section											
	I		II		III		IV		V		VI	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Belgium	1.6	1.8	4.1	2.4	2.2	2.8	2.7	2.3	5.6	4.8	6.6	4.7
FRG	3.0	1.8	5.0	2.3	3.9	3.0	2.8	2.5	7.1	4.9	8.3	4.9
Finland	1.6	2.1	2.7	2.7	2.3	3.2	1.4	2.6	4.0	5.1	4.8	5.0
Israel	3.0	2.2	2.9	2.5	3.7	3.3	3.2	2.7	6.8	5.3	7.3	5.9
Italy	1.7	2.2	3.1	2.6	3.1	3.5	2.0	2.6	4.1	4.7	4.9	5.3
Netherlands	3.5	2.2	5.2	2.4	5.5	3.2	4.4	2.2	8.2	4.2	10.5	4.6
Sweden	2.7	2.0	4.9	2.4	5.3	2.7	4.5	2.0	8.1	4.3	9.6	4.5
Thailand	2.1	1.8	2.3	2.1	2.9	3.1	2.2	2.3	4.6	4.0	4.3	3.9
No. of Items	6		8		10		6		14		16	

Subscores:
Section I Recognition of Antonyms
Section II Letter-Sound Correspondence
Section III Recognition of Structural Features
Section IV Vocabulary Recognition
Section V Comprehension of Short Sentences
Section VI Comprehension of Longer Passages
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.1

As can be seen, in comparison with other countries Sweden was first in Vocabulary Recognition, fourth in Recognition of Antonyms and third in Letter-Sound Correspondences but otherwise was consistently second to the Netherlands in the other sub-tests.

(ii) Listening

Fewer countries took part in the listening tests as throughout the IEA study countries could elect how many of the four skills (in addition to Reading Comprehension) they wished to test. Sweden took part in all the tests at both the Population II and Population IV levels and so did Belgium (French speaking), Finland and Italy. It is with these three countries therefore that a full comparison with all four skills can be made. (See Tables VI:4 and VI:5)

Table VI:4 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Listening Total Test and Sections I and II, Population II

Country	Total Test A		Total Test B		N
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	
Belgium (Fr.)	15.4	8.4	9.4	5.7	671
Finland	12.1	9.9	8.1	6.2	2118
Italy	9.1	6.8	8.9	6.4	694
Sweden	23.0	7.3	15.5	4.6	2269
Number of Items	36		24		

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.3

In Table VI:4, Total Test A contains information based on all three sections of the Listening Test. Total Test B contains information based only in Sections I and II of the Listening Test. Table VI:5 gives the part scores section by section for Listening, Population II.

Table VI:5 Means and Standard Deviations for Listening Sub-Scores, Population II

Country	Sub-Scores in Order of Sections					
	I		II		III	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Belgium (Fr.)	5.5	3.1	3.9	3.7	6.1	3.7
Finland	5.0	3.1	3.1	4.1	4.2	4.3
Italy	5.1	3.2	3.8	4.1	6.9	3.7
Sweden	8.0	2.2	7.6	3.2	7.7	3.4
Number of Items	12		12		12	

Section I Discrimination of Sounds (multiple choice).
Section II Listening Comprehension – short passages (multiple choice).
Section III Dictation.
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.3

Dictation was scored as follows:

Every word with any mistake in it was marked as one error irrespective of how many mistakes were made in that word. Punctuation was not counted. Omissions and inclusions of irrelevant words were counted as errors on the same basis as mistakes.

The total number of errors was then added up for each pupil and reduced to an item score of maximum 12 by means of the following conversion table:

Number of errors	Item score
97–112	0
89– 96	1
81– 88	2
73– 80	3
65– 72	4
57– 64	5
49– 56	6
41– 48	7
33– 40	8
25– 32	9
17– 24	10
9– 16	11
0– 8	12

As will be noted, Sweden scored the highest of all countries in each of the sub-tests and therefore the rank order for Total Listening was:

Sweden, Belgium, Finland, Italy.

(iii) Writing

Again it will be noted that only four countries took part in the Production tests at the Population II level.

Writing 1 in Table VI:6 means Sections I, II and III in the test consisting of multiple choice items dealing with Tenses, Structures and Word Order.

Writing 2 is the Composition, the scoring system for which is explained below.

Table VI:6 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing, Population II

Country	Total Mean	Writing 1 S.D.	N	Total Mean	Writing 2 S.D.	N
Belgium (Fr.)	12.5	6.8	697	388.2	138.4	680
Finland	9.7	8.4	2087	346.3	153.1	605
Italy	11.3	7.0	731	293.8	127.9	582
Sweden	14.2	7.4	2280	384.3	140.1	2011
No. of Items	31					

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.3

Scoring of Composition and Inter-Rater Reliability

A full account of the scoring procedures is given by Burstall (in Lewis & Massad, 1975). However, a short outline is given below.

Scripts from all the countries were scored by a panel in England using the following system:

a) the number of intelligible clauses was counted up to a maximum of 200 words
b) each intelligible clause was then scored for Accuracy as regards Grammar (syntax and morphology), Vocabulary and Spelling.

Each clause was scored from 0–3 for each of these aspects with 3 being the highest score for no errors and 0 being given for three or more errors or omissions.

The scorer then gave a Global Judgement on Variety as regards Variety of Tense and Structure, Range of Vocabulary, Cohesiveness (i.e. use of linking words and relative clauses). Each of these was scored from 0–3 with 3 showing the largest Variety.

Lastly, each scorer gave a Global Rating on each composition as a whole on a 0–4 scale where 0 indicated no response or an extremely poor response and 4 was an extremely good response. It should be noted that the Accuracy scores were arrived at by a process of counting errors or omissions, while the Variety scores were given as a global rating as was the rating for the whole composition.

Inter-rater reliability

The following can be quoted from Dr. Burstall's memo on the subject:

> "*Writing test* There had been 7 scorers who had scored Population 2 scripts consistently (There were a small number of scorers who had scored a few Population 2 scripts but not enough to take a random selection of global ratings for re-scoring) . . . 3 scripts per global ratings 0, 1, 2 and 3 were taken for each scorer. There were insufficient global ratings '4' from these 7 scorers, so, in order to re-score 21 global ratings '4', additional scripts were taken from scorers other than the original 7. A total of 105 scripts in all were re-scored by 5 scorers."

It should be noted that all re-scoring was done after all scripts for Population II (Composition) had been scored once. Further, in accordance with a memorandum from Dr. Carroll the scripts for re-scoring were selected at random from among the pool of cases established and no rater scored a script a second time which he had originally scored. The inter-rater reliability for part scores and global ratings are given in TableVI:7 (See also Carroll in Lewis & Massad, 1975).

Table VI:7 Inter-rater Reliabilities for Part Scores and Global Ratings: Writing

N = 100 (composition of sample: Belgium (Fr.): 28. Finland: 13. Sweden: 59.)

	correlation orig. score/sec.score	Original rating Mean	S.D.	Second rating Mean	S.D.
1. Global rating (whole composition)	.754	2.11	1.36	1.53	0.88
2. No. of clauses (volume)	.980	18.05	8.64	17.94	8.24
3. Accuracy: Grammar	.949	45.38	24.16	45.95	23.49
4. Accuracy: Vocabulary	.963	47.64	24.34	47.87	23.20
5. Accuracy: Spelling	.963	48.56	25.32	48.49	24.23
9. Variety: tense and structure	.647	1.56	0.91	1.34	0.82
10. Vocabulary (range)	.598	0.97	1.28	0.96	1.18
11. Cohesiveness	.613	1.75	0.99	1.75	0.82

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 5.8

As Carroll points out (Lewis & Massad, 1975):

> "The inter-rater reliabilities are quite high whenever they are based on quantity; they are lower when based on quality or variety."

It is well known that global ratings of compositions tend to be subjective (Ebel, 1965) and to vary widely in marks awarded (Starch and Elliott, 1912).

It is interesting that the above correlations support these findings though as Dr. Carroll points out reliabilities of around .75 are quite respectable for the global ratings and show that there was substantial agreement for this among raters in the IEA study. However, it can be seen from the very high inter-rater reliability for sub-scores for Accuracy that the more detailed the instructions given to the scorers the better the inter-rater reliability.

A full description of the formation of a composite writing score is given by Carroll (Lewis and Massad, 1975) so here it is sufficient to say that composites for Quality, Quantity and Variety were formed from the initial variables by relating the volume of

intelligible clauses to their accuracy and then weighting them by means of a regression analysis procedure to give a Quality Score. The Quantity Composite Score was established by weighting the three measures of Accuracy; the weighting again being established through the averaging of relativized regression weights. The composite Variety Score was established by the same process using the three initial variables of Variety: Variety of Tense and Structure; Range of Vocabulary; Cohesiveness; The composite for Total Writing 2 (i.e. the Composition) has already been given but in order to allow more detailed comment the initial variables for Accuracy and Variety are given in Table VI:8.

Table VI:8 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing (Composition) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population II

N	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Accuracy						Variety			
				Grammar		Vocabulary		Spelling		Tense and Structure		Range of Vocab.		Cohesiveness	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
695	Belgium (Fr.)	16.1	7.9	38.7	20.3	39.6	20.5	44.9	21.8	1.2	0.9	0.5	1.0	1.7	0.9
961	Finland	8.7	9.0	33.8	20.8	38.1	21.5	38.4	22.1	0.7	0.8	0.2	0.6	0.8	1.0
661	Italy	8.8	5.9	19.8	13.8	22.3	14.2	27.7	15.3	1.0	0.8	0.6	0.9	1.4	1.1
2046	Sweden	15.9	7.7	39.3	20.2	42.1	21.1	41.8	21.7	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.9	1.5	0.8

No norm can be given for the maximum score possible as, as has been pointed out, the maximum for each individual pupil depended both on volume and accuracy, and volume and variety. However, it is possible to work out the accuracy of each pupil's results in the following way:

$$\frac{\text{Accuracy Score}}{\text{No. of Intelligible Clauses} \times 3}$$

It should be noted, too, that the mean number of intelligible clauses in Table VI:8 includes all those who took the test even if they did not in fact write anything intelligible in the Composition. The figures in Table VI:9 are therefore based on all those who wrote at least one intelligible clause in the Composition.

Table VI:9 Means for Accuracy in Writing (Composition), Population II

N	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Mean score achieved for Accuracy: (%)		
				Grammar	Vocabulary	Spelling
		Mean	S.D.			
682	Belgium (Fr.)	16.4	7.6	76.6	78.8	91.4
608	Finland	13.8	7.6	78.3	91.2	91.5
598	Italy	9.7	5.4	62.6	73.5	85.4
2018	Sweden	16.1	7.6	79.8	85.7	84.0

The rank order for countries in total and in different aspects of accuracy as shown in Composition is given in Table VI:10.

Table VI:10 Rank Order of Countries in Accuracy of Writing (Composition), Population II

Table VI:10 Country	Total: Carroll weighting	Accuracy		
		Grammar	Vocabulary	Spelling
Belgium (Fr.)	1	3	3	2
Finland	3	2	1	1
Italy	4	4	4	3
Sweden	2	1	2	4

The interesting conclusion from the above, from the point of view of the Methodology Debate, is that Sweden is the most accurate of the four countries in the use of Grammar, but in the use of Vocabulary Swedish pupils are less accurate than Finnish pupils and that in Spelling accuracy Sweden is the worst of the four countries, although it should be pointed out that the standard of spelling is high in all countries. It will be remembered, too, that in the open-ended test of grammatical structures Swedish Population II pupils scored the highest of all countries. It would not seem therefore that in Writing Sweden has reached a lower standard of grammatical accuracy than other countries at the Population II level.

As far as Variety in the use of language is concerned, no country at this stage rises above a very low level; nor is a great deal more to be expected at the Population II level.

(iv) Speaking

In considering the outcomes of the Speaking tests, it should always be remembered that the samples tested are small in all cases and therefore caution must be exercised in interpreting the results, particularly when comparing countries. The outcomes of the Speaking tests are presented in Table VI:11.

Table VI:11 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Total Speaking and Sub-Scores, Population II

N	Country	Structural Control		Oral Reading		Total Speaking: Carroll Weighting	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
172	Belgium (Fr.)	7.6	4.8	13.4	5.5	208.6	73.6
252	Finland	6.1	4.9	20.9	7.7	198.0	97.3
72	Italy	8.7	6.5	15.3	4.9	197.6	76.8
221	Sweden	8.5	5.0	25.8	4.3	235.5	87.4
	Max. score	20		30			

The Fluency part of the test will be dealt with later but it should be remembered that that part-score is also included in the total score given above although Oral Reading is not. The rank order of the countries for the first two parts of the Speaking Test is given in Table VI:12.

Table IV:12 Rank Order of Countries for Structural Control and Oral Reading, Population II

Country	Structural Control	Oral Reading
Belgium (Fr.)	3	4
Finland	4	2
Italy	1	3
Sweden	2	1

It should be noted that the total possible score for Structural Control was 20, arrived at as follows:

10 items dealing with verb structure:
Simple Present Tense:
Answer to: Is the lamp on the table?
: 3rd person singular
: question with "do" with plural subject
: question with "does"
: Answer to: Is there a chair in the room?
Present Continuous; Past Continuous; Present Perfect;
Simple Past: positive statement
: asking question with "did"

The scoring was as follows:

0 = no response; "I don't know"; inappropriate or unintelligible or incorrect verb form
1 = appropriate and intelligible response employing the correct verb form but containing a peripheral error (e.g. wrong verb)
2 = appropriate and intelligible response, employing the correct verb form and free from grammatical errors

Pronunciation and fluency were not assessed in the part of the test that measured Structural Control and a student was therefore not penalised for hesitancy, poor pronunciation or faulty intonation.

In Oral Reading points were awarded on a right/wrong basis for the 30 phonemes and phrase units.

It can be seen (Table VI:11) that Population II Swedish students scored highest of the participating countries in pronunciation and were second best in the control of verb forms in speech.

Scoring of Fluency

Again, Burstall (in Lewis and Massad, 1975) gives a full account but, concisely, the scoring was conducted as follows:

All tapes were scored in England using the following system:

a) the number of intelligible clauses was counted up to a maximum of 30
b) each intelligible clause was then scored for Accuracy as regards Grammar (syntax and morphology), Vocabulary, and Pronunciation (including word stress). Each clause was scored from 0–3 for each of these aspects with 3 being the highest score for no errors and 0 being given for three or more errors or omissions.

The scorer then gave a Global Judgement on Variety as regards Variety of Tense and Structure, and Range of Vocabulary, Each of these was scored from 0–3 with 3 indicating the largest Variety.

Lastly, each scorer gave a Global Rating on the Speaking Test as a whole using a 0–4 scale where 0 was given for no response or an extremely poor response and 4 for an

extremely good response. As for Writing (Composition) it should be noted that the scores for Accuracy are therefore based on counting errors or omissions while the scores for Variety and the rating of the Speaking Test as a whole are based on global ratings.

Inter-rater reliability

The procedure employed in assessing inter-rater reliability is described by Burstall in a memo on how the scoring team re-rated the scores:

> "6 scorers had been involved in the scoring of Population 2 tapes. In order to reach a total of 90 tapes to be re-scored, it was hoped to take 3 tapes from each global rating (i.e. 0, 1, 2, 3, 4) from each original scorer and have these re-scored. This was possible for global ratings 0, 1, 2, and 3: there were not sufficient global ratings '4'.
>
> So all the global ratings '4' which existed for Population 2 were re-scored (N = 13). This gave a total of 85 tapes which were re-scored by 3 scorers. The 85 tapes were divided so that the 3 scorers marked 30, 27 and 28 tapes each of the various global ratings."

Again, as with Writing, all tapes were scored before re-scoring took place. The inter-rater reliability for part scores and global ratings together with details of the original and second scoring are given in Table VI:13.

Table VI:13 Inter-rater Reliabilities for Part Scores and Global Rating: Speaking

N = 82 (composition of sample: Belgium (Fr.): 10. Finland: 55. Italy: 1. Sweden: 16)

	Correlation orig. score/sec.score	Original rating Mean	Original rating S.D.	Second rating Mean	Second rating S.D.
1. Global rating (whole test)	.787	1.93	1.37	1.43	1.05
4. No. of clauses (volume)	.980	6.43	4.86	6.35	4.86
5. Accuracy: Grammar	.972	16.22	13.16	15.76	12.98
6. Accuracy: Vocabulary	.946	17.40	13.66	16.22	13.15
7. Accuracy: Pronunciation	.960	16.33	13.66	14.41	12.14
11. Variety: tense and structure	.655	0.85	1.00	0.72	0.74
12. Vocabulary (range)	.832	0.78	1.05	0.84	0.98

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 5.9

In addition, the inter-rater reliability for Structural Control was .961 and for Oral Reading .835.

Again, it can be seen that when scores are based on quantities in turn based on detailed instructions the inter-rater reliabilities are high.

For a full description of how the composite Speaking score was arrived at, see Carroll (Lewis and Massad, 1975). To summarise: relative quality scores were formed by dividing the quantity correct scores by the volume. These were then weighted according to the previously described regression analysis procedure where relativized regression weights were averaged and this resulted in a Quality score. Quantity and Variety scores were arrived at by weighting the measures of Accuracy and Variety respectively, the weights being decided by the technique outlined earlier. The composite for Total Speaking has already been given but the Means and Standard Deviations of the initial variables used for forming composites are given in Table VI:14.

Table VI:14 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Speaking (Fluency) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population II

N	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Accuracy Grammar		Vocabulary		Pronunciation		Variety Tense and Structure		Range of Vocabulary	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
172	Belgium (Fr.)	6.5	3.6	16.1	29.1	16.9	10.1	14.4	10.1	0.0	0.2	1.0	0.9
252	Finland	4.2	3.8	10.0	10.0	11.4	10.7	10.0	10.3	0.5	0.8	0.4	0.7
72	Italy	4.6	1.9	11.4	16.1	12.5	5.8	8.0	5.5	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.8
221	Sweden	5.7	2.6	13.8	7.5	14.3	7.3	14.9	8.0	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9

As with Writing (Composition) no norm can be given as a maximum score for Fluency as the maximum for each pupil depended on volume and accuracy as well as volume and variety.

However, again, a percentage score for Accuracy can be arrived at by dividing each Accuracy Score by the Number of Intelligible Clauses x 3 and then taking the mean of those scores. Table VI:15 is based only on those who succeeded in saying one or more intelligible clauses.

Table VI:15 Means for Accuracy in Speaking (Fluency), Population II

N	Country	No.of Intelligible Clauses		Mean score achieved for Accuracy: (%) Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation
		Mean	S.D.			
172	Belgium (Fr.)	6.5	3.6	80.6	85.0	70.0
203	Finland	5.2	3.6	60.6	72.8	60.4
71	Italy	4.7	1.9	78.3	88.6	55.1
218	Sweden	5.8	2.9	77.3	80.2	82.6

The rank order of countries in different aspects of the Speaking Test are shown in Table VI:16.

Table VI:16 Rank Order of Countries for Total Speaking and for Sub-Scores, Population II

Country	Total: Carroll weighting	Gram.	Vocab.	Pron.	Tense and Struct.	Range of Vocab.	Tests Struct. Control	Oral Read
Belgium (Fr.)	2	1	2	2	4	1	3	4
Finland	3	4	4	3	2	4	4	2
Italy	4	2	1	4	3	3	1	3
Sweden	1	3	3	1	1	2	2	1

As in Writing (Composition) Sweden does not in Speaking produce as great a volume of response as Belgium, although more than other countries. However as compared to Writing Sweden is less accurate in both Grammar and Vocabulary and this is reflected in the international comparison, and also in the fact that Sweden was only second best in the Structural Control in Speech Test. In Pronunciation, however, Sweden was the most

accurate of all the countries and this accuracy can also be seen in the other part-tests in Speaking where Sweden achieved the best results of the four countries in Oral Reading and also in Dictation.

Discussion of the Population II results

a) Evaluation in an international perspective

Undoubtedly Sweden's all round performance is better than that of any other of the four countries concerned *if all four skills* are considered. However, it should be noted that the Netherlands achieved a better result than Sweden in Reading as did Belgium in Writing (Composition), but as the Netherlands took only the Reading Test comparisons cannot be made for all the four skills. In Listening, Writing 1 (i.e. production of tenses and Structures and Recognition of Word Order), and Total Speaking Belgium was second to Sweden.

However, the outcomes of the cognitive tests, internationally, must be considered in relation to the input as regards time and budgetary resources spent on the teaching of English. Table VI:17 indirectly gives some information about this for the Population II samples.

Table VI:17 Distribution of Population II Samples over Grades, and Average Age for the Different Samples

Country	Grade 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Average age for the sample
Belgium (Fr.)	0.0	0.0	31.2	68.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5
FRG	1.3	10.3	53.1	27.6	7.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.4
Finland	2.8	31.0	64.3	1.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5
Israel	0.0	0.1	12.5	86.7	0.0	0.0	0.7	0.0	14.7
Italy	0.0	0.0	51.1	48.9	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.6
Netherlands	0.0	0.5	27.8	71.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5
Sweden	0.0	40.9	58.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5
Thailand	0.6	1.4	37.8	51.4	8.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	14.5

If we take the *maximum* number of years that the students could have studied English, we can then estimate the *maximum* amount of exposure they could have had to English in school. Table VI:18 gives this information.

Table VI:18 Maximum Exposure to English of Population II Samples

	Belg.	FRG	Finland	Israel	Italy	Netherl.	Sweden	Thailand
Estimated % of Pop. II studying English.	72.5	89.0	75.8	74.4	55.4	97.3	94.1	97.6
Grade when most students began English (Mean).	7.1	5.1	5.9	5.1	6.5	6.6	4.0	5.9
No. of periods a week of English. Beginners: (Mean):	4.5	4.7	3.0	3.3	2.8	2.8	2.0	5.7
Intermediate:	3.9	3.8	3.3	4.6	3.1	3.1	4.0	6.1
No. of minutes English a week. Beginners: (Mean):	224.3	212.9	138.5	163.1	160.2	140.7	80.0	313.8
Intermediate:	196.0	169.4	148.2	211.7	176.3	154.5	160.0	338.5
MAXIMUM POSSIBLE TIME SPENT ON ENGLISH AT TIME OF IEA TESTS (HOURS):	365	562	266	551	354	302	360	803

See also: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 6.9

The number of hours has been calculated as if the school year in which students took the IEA tests had been completed. Further, with this information it is impossible to give more than a rough approximate figure for the number of hours of English instruction. The figure has been arrived at in the following way:

[(Highest grade by which 90% at least of IEA Population II would be included) – (Grade in which English started – 1)] x Average Number of minutes English per week x Number of weeks in school year (36).

This was then reduced to hours to the nearest whole number. However, even if this is only a rough approximation it is better than merely counting the years of English that students would have had by the end of the "IEA Test Year" (See Table VI:19).

Table VI:19 Rank Order of Countries for Hours and Years Exposure to English (the Country with the Greatest Number being Shown as 1 in Each Case), Population II

Country	Hours of English		Years of English	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Thailand	803	1	4.1	4
FRG	562	2	4.9	2=
Israel	551	3	4.9	2=
Belgium (Fr.)	365	4	2.9	8
Sweden	360	5	5.0	1
Italy	354	6	3.5	5
Netherlands	302	7	3.4	6
Finland	266	8	3.1	7

It has been suggested that "learning attainments are on the average, at least, a function of amount of time spent in learning" (Carroll, 1973, p.4). As far as Population II students of English is concerned this does not seem to be confirmed if one considers the amount of time given to English as a whole. However, it may well be that the cognitive results reflect how much time is spent on each of the four skills separately. This would be in agreement with the Scherer and Wertheimer (1964) study that students learn what they are taught. The Swedish cognitive results would then adequately reflect the amount of time spent (in teachers' perception) on the practice of different skills (*supra* percentages of total teaching time). The international comparison also shows that the total time spent on English in Sweden at this level is not greater than in most other countries who took part in the study, although in most aspects of English the results achieved are better in Sweden than in other countries. The percentage figures for those taught English are also high in Sweden at the Population II level; only the Netherlands and Thailand having higher figures. These results therefore reflect great credit on Swedish teachers of English since the school makes much more of a difference in the learning of foreign languages than in, for example, Science or Literature.

b) Internal evaluation

It is necessary, also to judge how well schools in Sweden have achieved their aims in English as set out in the curriculum plan. If the validity argument set out earlier is accepted there is still, however, one difficulty left in judging mean achievement and that is what standard of achievement is acceptable in terms of absolute standards or criteria. To my knowledge there is no official guidance for this and therefore the following judgement must be subjective. The mean results achieved by Swedish Population II pupils as percentages in the various tests are given in Table VI:20.

Table VI:20 Results Achieved by Swedish Students in Cognitive Tests as Percentages of Total Scores, Population II

RECOGNITION			
Reading	Total	: 58.3 %	
	Part scores	: Vocabulary (antonyms and vocab.)	: 60.0 %
		: Letter-Sound correspondences	: 61.3 %
		: Structures	: 53.0 %
		: Reading comprehension (passages)	: 59.0 %
Listening	Total	: 63.6 %	
	Part scores	: Discrimination of sounds	: 66.7 %
		: Listening comprehension	: 63.3 %
		: Dictation	: 64.5 %
PRODUCTION			
Writing:			
	Part scores	: Tenses, structures and word order	: 45.8 %
		: Composition: Accuracy: Grammar	: 79.8 %
		Vocabulary	: 85.7 %
		Spelling	: 84.0 %
Speaking			
	Part scores	: Structural control (verbs)	: 42.5 %
		: Oral Reading	: 86.0 %
		: Fluency: Accuracy: Grammar	: 77.3 %
		Vocabulary	: 80.2 %
		Pronunciation	: 82.6 %

Subjectively, this looks a satisfactory result *if* the assumption is that the average pupil should achieve approximately 50 % of the aims of the course. One must note, however, that tests constructed so as to yield "normal distribution" pre-suppose that there will be roughly a 50 % degree of difficulty. Even bearing this in mind, it will be seen that, as expected, the productive skills are less well-achieved than those only requiring recognition; and it is surprising, when the Curriculum Plan and the teachers both assign Writing to the lowest place in the hierarchy of skills, that the Writing result is on the whole better than that of Speaking. It is also noteworthy that the worst of all the part results is in the Oral Production of Structures, in this case the normal tenses. Further, if the recognition of structures in Reading and their production in Speech and Writing are compared it would *not* seem as if a high standard of grammatical accuracy had been achieved by the average pupil in Grades 7 and 8 in *grundskolan*. It is also of interest that the recognition skills correlate better with each other and with "guided" production, than they do with the "free" productive skills. Another instance of the "Scherer-Wertheimer effect" noted above i.e. that "free" productive skills whether in speech or writing need to be practised if a reasonable standard is to be achieved. It is also a reflection of the difference in complexity of Speech and Written Production, referred to earlier, that the correlation between Writing (Composition) and Total Speaking is the lowest of all the intercorrelations. (See Table VI:21).

Finally, it should be remembered that all the above judgements have been based on the average pupil. They do not tell us "how many have been brought how far". However, these results do enable us to say that as far as the average pupil is concerned Sweden had nothing to fear from an international comparison at the Population II level and that therefore the English teaching methods adopted by Swedish teachers produced a reasonable result, when Sweden is compared to other countries. By an absolute standard, on the other hand, there was still room for improvement in Swedish pupils' grammatical achievement and in the amount of English produced both in writing and speech.

Table VI:21 Intercorrelations of Cognitive Measures: Swedish students, Population II

	1	2	3	4	5	Number responding to each measure
1. English Reading	–	.80	.69	.81	.57	2331
2. English Listening		–	.66	.78	.55	2277
3. Total Speaking (does not include Oral Reading)			–	.66	.44	218
4. Writing 1 (Tenses, Structures, Word Order)				–	.61	2279
5. Writing 2 (Composition)					–	2009

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.20

B) POPULATION IV

(i) Reading

The means and standard deviations of the Total Reading Test, which was administered in all countries, are presented in Table VI:22.

Table: VI:22 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Reading Total Test, Population IV

	Mean	S.D.	N
Belgium (Fr.)	24.2	10.8	1440
Chile	10.6	9.8	2118
FRG	41.2	6.1	1374
Finland	35.6	8.3	2310
Hungary	20.1	11.2	1063
Israel	27.4	12.9	604
Italy	20.2	12.6	324
Netherlands	42.9	6.5	1561
Sweden	39.5	9.0	1626
Thailand	19.7	9.1	937
Number of Items	60		

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.2

It should be remembered that at the Population IV level for all tests the Swedish sample included both pupils at *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* and not only *gymnasium* pupils. These two sub-groups together comprise about 45 % of the relevant age group as compared to much lower proportions in other countries. The spread is much lower in the Netherlands and the Federal Republic of Germany than in Sweden. The outcome therefore speaks well for Swedish secondary education in general.

Rank order of countries in Total Reading was:
the Netherlands, Federal Republic of Germany, Sweden, Finland, Israel, Belgium (Fr.), Italy, Hungary, Thailand, Chile.

The sub-scores for the Reading Test are given in Table VI:23. It will be noted that the only two countries to occupy one of the first three positions in all sub-tests are the Netherlands and Sweden; Sweden obtaining its best comparative score in Comprehension of Short Sentences and its worst in Recognition of Word Stress.

Table VI:23 Means and Standard Deviations for Reading Sub-Scores, Population IV

Country	Sub-Scores in Order of Section									
	I		II		III		IV		V	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Belgium (Fr.)	1.5	2.0	1.1	1.8	3.0	2.5	6.4	2.8	12.3	5.7
Chile	1.6	2.0	0.7	1.5	0.9	2.2	2.9	3.0	4.9	5.2
FRG	5.1	1.8	2.8	1.7	5.1	1.8	8.7	1.5	19.5	3.0
Finland	2.6	2.3	2.9	2.0	5.5	1.9	8.7	1.7	15.9	4.5
Hungary	1.8	2.1	1.6	2.2	2.9	2.8	5.3	2.7	8.6	5.5
Israel	3.0	2.4	1.8	2.2	4.6	2.5	7.2	2.8	11.4	6.7
Italy	2.2	2.4	1.7	1.9	2.8	2.6	4.9	3.0	8.8	7.0
Netherlands	5.0	2.2	3.9	1.9	5.4	2.1	9.0	1.5	19.7	3.0
Sweden	3.8	2.6	3.3	1.7	5.2	2.2	9.2	1.8	17.8	4.5
Thailand	0.9	1.7	1.2	1.7	3.5	2.6	5.7	2.7	8.4	4.7
No. of Items	8		8		8		11		25	

Sub-Scores:
Section I Recognition of Word Stress
Section II Collocations
Section III Recognition of Grammatical Structures
Section IV Comprehension of Short Sentences
Section V Comprehension of Longer Passages
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.2

(ii) Listening

Six countries took part in the Listening Test. These six countries are listed in Table VI:24 and it will be noted that it was these six countries that took part in tests of all the four skills at the Population IV level.

Table VI:24 Means, Standard Deviations, N's and Rank Order of Countries Total Listening, Population IV

Country	Mean	S.D.	N
Sweden	26.2	5.4	1579
Finland	23.2	6.1	2296
Belgium (Fr.)	16.9	7.0	1394
Hungary	16.3	7.3	1063
Italy	14.7	7.6	314
Chile	7.1	4.5	231

Total no. of Items: 36

Sweden's high mean score is very satisfactory but it is also a confirmation of the judgement made earlier that the Listening Test would not be of sufficient degree of difficulty to extend Swedish *gymnasium* pupils. Hence the need for the Special Listening Comprehension Test reported in Chapter VII. The sub-scores for the IEA Listening Test are given in Table VI:25.

Table VI:25 Means and Standard Deviations for Listening Sub-Scores, Population IV

Country	Sub-Scores in Order of Sections							
	I		II		III		IV	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Belgium (Fr.)	7.1	2.7	5.8	1.9	2.4	2.7	1.7	2.6
Chile	2.9	2.8	4.3	2.1	0.2	1.9	−0.2	1.8
Finland	8.4	2.3	5.5	2.0	4.2	2.4	5.0	2.3
Hungary	6.2	3.0	6.2	1.6	2.1	2.8	1.8	2.8
Italy	5.7	2.8	5.8	1.6	2.1	2.6	1.6	2.7
Sweden	9.2	1.9	5.4	1.9	5.4	2.1	6.5	1.8
Number of Items	12		8		8		8	

Sub-Scores:
Section I Discrimination of Sounds
Section II Recognition of Meaning through Intonation
Section III Listening Comprehension – Sentences or Short Paragraphs
Section IV Listening Comprehension – Conversation
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.2

Apart from scoring best in the total test, Sweden also came first in all the sections of the tests except Section II (Recognition of Meaning through Intonation) where Sweden was last but one. It is noteworthy, too, that only Sweden and Finland produced reasonable results in what might be called "global comprehension" i.e. Sections III and IV. It will be remembered that Sweden was the highest of all countries in the use of "tape recorder – whole class" and if we tabulate rank order for "global" listening comprehension with use of "tape recorder – whole class" we obtain the result presented in Table VI:26.

Table VI:26 Rank Order of Countries for Global Comprehension and Use of Tape Recorder – Whole Class, Population IV

Country	Sect. III		Sect. IV		Use of tape recorder – whole class	
	Mean	Rank order	Mean	Rank order	% of teachers frequently using	Rank order
Sweden	5.4	1	6.5	1	95.1	1
Finland	4.2	2	5.0	2	57.0	3
Belgium	2.4	3	1.7	4	56.6	4
Hungary	2.1	4=	1.8	3	66.8	2
Italy	2.1	4=	1.6	5	8.8	6
Chile	0.2	6	−0.2	6	10.9	5

There is obviously not a one to one relationship, as other factors such as affinity between mother tongue and English, opportunities to hear English outside school and so on must also be involved. However, it should be worth further study to investigate the relationship between the practice of listening to English "globally" by means of recordings and improvement in comprehension.

(iii) Writing

The scoring procedures for Population IV are exactly as described for Population II, the writing test being exactly the same. The same weighting procedures were used by Carroll to arrive at Total Writing 2 as presented in Table VI:27.

Table VI:27 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing Test, Population IV

Country	Total Mean	Writing 1 S.D.	N	Total Mean	Writing 2 S.D.	N
Belgium (Fr.)	20.5	6.0	1391	430.9	124.7	1361
Chile	7.2	4.8	183	262.2	104.9	158
Finland	26.6	3.2	2238	485.7	102.8	997
Hungary	18.2	7.2	1063	394.8	142.1	566
Italy	18.9	6.0	322	384.9	116.9	315
Sweden	25.3	4.6	1544	545.3	120.0	1514
No. of Items	31					

As with Population II it is also of interest to analyse the part scores for Writing (Composition) which are given in Table VI:28.

Table VI:28 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Writing (Composition) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population IV

N	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Accuracy Grammar		Vocabulary		Spelling		Tense and Structure		Variety Range of Vocab.		Cohesiveness	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1395	Belgium (Fr.)	17.2	7.2	42.5	18.6	43.4	18.7	48.9	19.9	1.3	0.8	0.9	1.1	2.1	0.8
166	Chile	8.2	5.2	16.9	12.3	20.0	13.1	21.8	13.5	1.2	0.3	0.0	0.3	1.2	0.8
1003	Finland	18.7	5.8	50.1	16.4	51.8	16.3	53.3	16.6	1.7	0.7	1.2	1.2	2.0	0.7
580	Hungary	14.9	6.9	37.1	19.2	40.4	18.9	42.3	19.7	1.6	0.8	0.5	1.0	1.5	1.0
316	Italy	12.9	5.7	27.0	15.7	29.6	15.2	35.7	16.5	1.5	0.7	1.0	1.1	2.4	0.7
1492	Sweden	22.4	6.5	58.7	18.6	61.5	18.6	62.5	19.1	1.9	0.7	1.5	1.2	2.3	0.7

If the scores for accuracy are re-calculated to include only those who wrote one or more intelligible clauses and each pupil's composition is judged for percentage accuracy by using the same calculation as for the Population II Writing (Composition) then this results in the average accuracy scores presented in Table VI:29.

Table VI:29 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Accuracy in Writing (Composition), Population IV

N	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Mean score achieved for Accuracy: (%) Grammar	Vocabulary	Spelling
		Mean	S.D.			
1364	Belgium (Fr.)	17.6	6.8	79.1	80.8	91.8
161	Chile	8.4	5.1	63.2	75.4	84.8
997	Finland	18.9	5.6	88.0	91.2	94.0
569	Hungary	15.2	6.7	78.0	87.9	91.5
315	Italy	13.0	5.7	66.4	74.8	90.9
1489	Sweden	22.4	6.4	85.8	90.4	91.9

It can be noted that the standard of accuracy in most countries is high and that for every country there is a steadily rising curve in accuracy from grammar through vocabulary to spelling. It appears that by the Population IV level, the so-called terrors of English spelling have largely disappeared. However, it is also noteworthy that the standard of

accuracy is higher in Composition than in Writing 1 where a more varied selection of structures is tested. It appears that in Composition, as teachers have often said, pupils use those structures and that vocabulary they are sure of and therefore Composition is not necessarily a complete test of a pupil's ability to use more complex tenses and structures accurately. However, composition is more than just accuracy in grammar, spelling and vocabulary. To quote Newberry: "It would seem that the apt choice, combination and inter-relationship of words to form a conceptual hierarchy are the ways in which individual mastery of language is manifested" (Newberry, 1967, p.405). It was because the International Committee recognised this that the ratings of various forms of Variety were included in the scoring. The maximum possible for each form of Variety was 3; and it will be noted, from Table VI:28 that Population IV students scored higher in all three forms of Variety than did Population II students. It can be seen, too, that Swedish pupils have learned this aspect of English writing, on the whole, better than those of other countries, although accuracy in grammar, spelling and vocabulary was not as high as in Finland. This was also reflected in the result of the open-ended test of grammatical structures (Writing 1) where the rank order was:

Finland, Sweden, Belgium (French speaking), Italy, Hungary, Chile.

If, however, the countries are ranked for all aspects of Writing (Composition) it will be seen, in Table VI:30, that Sweden's Population IV students performed well in an international comparison both as regards accuracy and variety.

Table VI:30 Rank Order of Countries in Different Aspects of Writing (Composition), Population IV

Country	Total: Carroll weighting	Accuracy			Variety		Cohesiveness
		Grammar	Vocabulary	Spelling	Tense and Struct.	Range of Vocab.	
Belgium (Fr.)	3	3	4	3	5	4	3
Chile	6	6	5	6	6	6	6
Finland	2	1	1	1	2	2	4
Hungary	4	4	3	4	3	5	5
Italy	5	5	6	5	4	3	1
Sweden	1	2	2	2	1	1	2

(iv) Speaking

The samples for the Speaking Tests were small, consisting as they did of sub-samples of the samples, and therefore differences between countries should be treated with caution and care exercised in interpreting the results. The outcomes of the Speaking Tests are given in Table VI:31.

Table VI:31 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Total Speaking and Sub-Scores, Population IV

N	Country	Structural Control		Oral Reading		Total Speaking: Carroll weighting	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
202	Belgium (Fr.)	8.9	4.2	17.0	5.1	242.1	69.4
196	Chile	2.8	2.8	22.4	4.2	143.5	64.5
300	Finland	12.2	3.8	26.1	3.5	298.7	87.3
125	Hungary	8.7	5.0	26.9	4.2	302.6	122.7
31	Italy	10.3	4.3	20.9	7.5	270.1	72.1
213	Sweden	13.0	3.8	28.2	2.6	343.4	85.9
	Maximum score:	20		30			

Total Speaking does not include Oral Reading. The rank order of countries for the first two parts of the Speaking Test are presented in Table VI:32.

Table VI:32 Rank Order of Countries in First Two Parts of Speaking Test, Population IV

Country	Structural Control	Oral Reading
Belgium (Fr.)	4	6
Chile	6	4
Finland	2	3
Hungary	5	2
Italy	3	5
Sweden	1	1

Carroll's procedure for weighting the Fluency score has already been described for Population II Speaking but as Population IV had two Fluency sections the two Fluency scores were averaged for inclusion in the weighting procedure (Carroll in Lewis and Massad, 1975). The means and standard deviations for the initial variables used for forming composites are given in Tables VI:33 and VI:34.

Table VI:33 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Speaking (Fluency A) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population IV

	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Accuracy						Variety			
				Grammar		Vocab.		Pronun.		Tense and Structure		Range of Vocab.	
N		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
202	Belgium (Fr.)	7.9	3.9	19.7	11.0	19.8	10.6	16.3	10.0	0.2	0.5	1.1	0.9
196	Chile	3.1	3.5	6.4	8.4	7.1	9.1	4.9	7.6	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.6
300	Finland	7.8	4.9	20.4	13.0	20.5	12.8	18.6	12.9	0.7	0.8	1.3	0.8
125	Hungary	11.4	7.8	29.7	22.2	31.1	21.6	27.6	20.8	1.2	0.8	0.8	0.9
31	Italy	6.9	4.0	17.1	11.5	19.0	9.6	14.1	8.8	0.6	0.5	1.5	0.9
213	Sweden	8.9	5.1	22.8	13.9	23.4	13.9	22.9	13.6	1.2	0.8	1.2	0.8

Table VI:34 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Speaking (Fluency B) Intelligible Clauses, Accuracy and Variety, Population IV

N	Country	No. of intelligible clauses		Accuracy						Variety			
				Grammar		Vocab.		Pronun.		Tense and Structure		Range of Vocab.	
		Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
196	Belgium (Fr.)	9.6	4.6	24.5	13.0	25.0	12.6	20.9	12.1	0.4	0.6	0.6	0.9
196	Chile	3.7	4.4	7.9	10.2	8.7	10.9	6.5	9.0	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.4
300	Finland	9.8	5.6	26.2	16.1	27.1	16.4	24.9	16.4	0.7	0.8	0.6	0.9
120	Hungary	12.1	8.3	32.1	23.9	33.5	23.2	30.4	23.1	1.3	0.8	0.6	0.9
31	Italy	9.1	3.4	24.0	10.5	24.8	9.6	19.6	9.4	1.1	0.6	0.9	1.3
213	Sweden	12.3	6.8	32.1	18.1	34.0	19.4	32.9	18.9	1.5	0.8	0.6	1.0

As with Writing (Composition), a percentage accuracy score was calculated for each pupil. The means for each country are given in Table IV:35, the scores being based on those pupils who wrote one or more intelligible clauses.

Table VI:35 Means, Standard Deviations and N's for Accuracy in Speaking (Fluency A), Population IV

N	Country	No. of Intelligible Clauses		Accuracy (%)		
				Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation
		Mean	S.D.			
202	Belgium (Fr.)	7.9	3.9	81.2	80.8	66.9
121	Chile	5.0	3.3	40.9	45.9	29.2
294	Finland	7.9	4.8	84.9	85.8	76.1
124	Hungary	11.5	7.7	81.6	88.6	76.8
31	Italy	6.9	4.0	79.2	91.8	66.8
213	Sweden	8.9	5.1	87.9	90.6	88.3

One thing is immediately noticeable from Table VI:35, namely that Sweden was the only country that showed higher accuracy in pronunciation as compared to grammar. All the other countries had less accuracy in pronunciation than they had in grammar. This is consistent with the results in Listening (Discrimination of Sounds) where Sweden had the highest part score, and in Recognition of Word Stress (in Reading) where Sweden had the highest score of those countries that also took part in the other tests; in Oral Reading (in the Speaking Test) Sweden again had the highest mean.

Table VI:36 Means, Standards Deviations and N's for Accuracy in Speaking (Fluency B), Population IV

N	Country	No. of Intelligible Clauses		Accuracy (%)		
				Grammar	Vocabulary	Pronunciation
		Mean	S.D.			
196	Belgium (Fr.)	9.6	4.6	83.2	85.4	70.7
103	Chile	6.9	3.8	36.9	40.8	29.6
292	Finland	10.1	5.5	85.1	88.5	79.7
119	Hungary	12.2	8.3	85.5	91.5	80.3
31	Italy	9.1	3.4	86.4	90.4	70.1
208	Sweden	12.8	6.6	86.7	89.6	87.0

Again, Sweden was the only country to be more slightly accurate in pronunciation than grammar and this is consistent with the findings for Fluency A, namely that in all part tests dealing with pronunciation Sweden had the best results of all countries taking part. In Fluency B, Sweden had the highest total for volume of utterance (as compared to the second highest in Fluency A) and in accuracy of grammar and vocabulary was first and third respectively, as compared to first and second respectively in Fluency A, although the difference between countries was very small.

The rank orders of mean performance in the various aspects of Speaking are presented in Table VI:37.

Table VI:37 Rank Order of Countries in Different Aspects of the Speaking Test, Population IV

Country	Total: Carroll weighting	Grammar		Accuracy Vocab.		Pronun.		Variety Tense and Struct.		Variety Range of Vocab.		Limited Item Tests Struct. Control	Limited Item Tests Oral Reading
		A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B		
Belgium (Fr.)	4	4	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	4	2=	4	6
Chile	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	6	4
Finland	3	2	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	2	2=	2	3
Hungary	2	3	3	3	1	2	2	1=	2	5	2=	5	2
Italy	5	5	2	1	2	5	5	4	3	1	1	3	5
Sweden	1	1	1	2	3	1	1	1=	1	3	2=	1	1

Discussion of Population IV results

a) International outcome

Again Sweden's all round performance is the best of any country that participated in tests of all four skills.

Table VI:38 Rank Order of Countries in All Four Skills, Population IV

Country	Reading	Listening	Writing Tenses, Structures and Word Order	Writing Composition (Carroll weighting)	Total Speaking (Carroll weighting)
Sweden	3	1	2	1	1
Finland	4	2	1	2	3
Belgium	6	3	3	3	5
Hungary	8	4	5	4	2
Italy	7	5	4	5	4
Chile	10	6	6	6	6

In Reading 10 countries participated; in all the other tests 6 countries participated.

However, the outcome should again be compared to the amount of time and money spent on the teaching of English. The information available for the Population IV level is presented in Tables VI:39–VI:42.

Table VI:39 Percentages of Samples in Different Grades, and Average Ages for Samples, Population IV

Country	Grade 6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	Average age for the sample
Belgium (Fr.)	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	18.4
Chile	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	99.4	0.5	18.6
FRG	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	99.8	18.7
Finland	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	93.2	6.8	19.1
Hungary	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	99.8	0.2	18.3
Israel	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	99.7	0.3	17.7
Italy	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	99.8	19.6
Netherlands	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	70.8	28.8	0.0	18.0
Sweden	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	29.4	70.6	0.0	19.3
Thailand	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	4.2	95.6	0.0	18.0

In order to calculate the exposure to English in school, the information given in Table VI:40 was used.

Table VI:40 Maximum Exposure to English of Population IV Samples

	Belg.	Chile	FRG	Finland	Hungary	Israel	Italy	Netherl.	Sweden	Thailand
Grade when most students began English (Mean):	7.6	7.4	5.3	5.6	9.0	5.4	9.0	6.9	4.0	4.9
No. of periods a week of English. Beginners (Mean):	3.2	3.4	5.4	4.2	2.2	4.0	3.0	2.9	2.0	5.5
Intermediate (Mean):	3.0	3.4	4.2	3.8	2.2	4.8	3.1	3.0	4.0	5.9
Advanced (Mean):	2.7	3.3	4.0	3.7	5.5	5.0	3.3	3.1	3.0	6.8
No. of minutes of English a week. Beginners (Mean):	161.3	147.5	248.4	186.4	109.0	200.0	176.1	147.1	80.0	322.3
Intermediate (Mean):	149.4	152.2	187.9	171.5	98.8	217.2	179.3	152.1	160.0	345.0
Advanced (Mean):	135.1	143.7	180.9	163.7	247.5	225.9	193.0	151.1	120.0	470.1
MAXIMUM POSSIBLE TIME SPENT ON ENGLISH AT TIME OF IEA TESTS (HOURS):	482	497	1074	772	594	978	548	549	648	1842

The number of hours has been calculated as if the school year in which students took the IEA tests had been completed. Naturally this is an approximate figure for the number of hours of English instruction. The figure, (as with Population II) has been arrived at in the following way:

[(Highest grade by which 90% at least of IEA Population IV would be included) – (Grade in which English Started – 1)] x Average Number of minutes English per week x Number of weeks in school year (36).

This was reduced to hours to the nearest whole number.

It should be noted that in the case of Hungary, different "lines" of pupils have differing amounts of English per week; the figure given therefore would only apply to Hungarian pupils taking the "Special English Line" and is therefore the maximum number of hours that Population IV Hungarian pupils could be expected to study English.

The rank order of countries in years and hours of English is given in Table VI:41. The country with the greatest number is shown as 1 in each case.

Table VI:41 Rank Order of Countries for Hours and Years Exposure to English, Population IV

Country	Hours of English		Years of English	
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank
Thailand	1842	1	8.1	3
FRG	1074	2	8.7	2
Israel	978	3	7.6	4
Finland	772	4	7.4	5
Sweden	648	5	9.0	1
Hungary	594	6	4.0	10
Netherlands	549	7	6.1	6
Italy	548	8	5.0	9
Chile	497	9	5.6	7
Belgium (Fr.)	482	10	5.4	8

Again, the idea that for English the amount achieved is a function of the amount of time spent is not supported by these results if English is taken as a whole. A better measure would be the amount of time spent on each skill and it is interesting to note that the two countries that did best in Reading (FRG and the Netherlands) only entered for that skill,

a reflection perhaps of a concentration on that skill in those countries. The Swedish results, however, reflect practice in all four skills which is also seen in the teacher's perception of classroom time taken for all four skills in Sweden. It would be interesting to measure the time given to speaking in Hungary, too, as in that skill Hungarian students with less time at their disposal than many other countries were better than any country except Sweden.

However, achievement is also a matter of "retentivity" and cost. Table VI:42 shows that while Sweden (as a percentage) spends more on foreign language instruction than any other country at the Population II level, it spends less than Finland, Hungary, the Federal Republic of Germany, and the Netherlands at the Population IV level. It can also be seen that Sweden retains a greater proportion of students to a greater age in the upper secondary school than any other country in this survey; in addition Sweden teaches English to over 90 % of students at the Population IV level.

Table VI:42 Percentages of Age Group at School and Studying English, Population IV; Percentage of School Budget for Foreign Language Instruction, Populations II and IV

Country	% of age grouping in school at Pop. IV level (estimated)	estimated % of Pop. IV students studying English	estimated % of annual school budget for foreign language instruction	
			Pop. II	Pop. IV
Belgium (Fr.)	33	87.1	–	–
Chile	16	97.6	–	10.1
FRG	9[a]	74.6	10.4	16.1
Finland	21	88.4	12.9	22.6
Hungary	28	35.6	–	17.5
Israel	–	92.8	7.6	9.8
Italy	16	67.7	10.2	7.9
Netherlands	13	98.2	16.9	16.3
Sweden	45	91.3	17.1	14.0
Thailand	10	93.6	13.1	8.5

a. "Population IV was defined by the FRG as only those students in the *gymnasium*. If the whole age group is considered some 30 % of the students are still at school."
Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 6.3

The "retentivity" in the Swedish system is well-illustrated by these figures and it appears therefore that Swedish teachers of English have been able to bring more pupils further in knowledge of the four skills of English than has been achieved in other countries.

b) Internal evaluation

It was pointed out earlier that as far as grammar is concerned it is difficult to discuss the validity of these tests at the Population IV level in terms of content and construct validity. However, the "face validity" of the grammar production test for Population IV is not high, as all the tests of Production of Tenses and Structures in Speech and Writing are the same for Population II and Population IV and whereas it has been shown that for Population II these tests have reasonable validity, this does not give high face validity to these as tests of Tense and Structure for Population IV. However, the fact that both Population II and Population IV took the same Production tests in Tense and Structure enables comparisons between the populations to be made. Table VI:43 gives the percentage results achieved in all the Population IV tests and Table VI:44 compares Population II and Population IV results on those tests which were identical.

Table VI:43 Mean Scores in Cognitive Tests as Percentages of Total Scores: Swedish students, Population IV

RECOGNITION				
Reading	Total	: 65.6 %		
	Part scores	: Recognition of Word Stress	: 47.5 %	
		: Collocations	: 41.8 %	
		: Recognition of Grammatical Structures	: 65.0 %	
		: Comprehension (Short Sentences)	: 83.6 %	Combined: 75.0 %
		: Comprehension (passages)	: 71.2 %	
Listening	Total	: 72.8 %		
	Part scores	: Discrimination of Sounds	: 70.8 %	
		: Meaning through Intonation	: 67.5 %	
		: Comprehension (sentences or short paragraphs)	: 67.5 %	Combined: 74.4 %
		: Comprehension (conversation)	: 81.3 %	
PRODUCTION				
Writing				
	Part scores	: Tenses, structures and word order	: 81.6 %	
		Composition: Accuracy:		
		Grammar	: 85.8 %	
		Vocabulary	: 90.4 %	
		Spelling	: 91.9 %	
Speaking				
	Part scores	: Structural control (verbs)	: 65.0 %	
		Oral Reading	: 94.0 %	
		Fluency A: Accuracy:		
		Grammar	: 87.9 %	
		Vocabulary	: 90.6 %	
		Pronunciation	: 88.3 %	
		Fluency B: Accuracy:		
		Grammar	: 86.7 %	
		Vocabulary	: 89.6 %	
		Pronunciation	: 87.0 %	

Assuming that the percentage results reflect to what extent aims and objectives have been achieved the weakest parts of the results concern:

(i) the hardest parts of the recognition test, namely Collocations and Word Stress

(ii) the recognition of grammatical structures and their production in speech

It is noticeable that in both writing and speech a high degree of accuracy is achieved but, as has been pointed out here earlier, this seems to mean that pupils are accurate in what they write and speak when they confine themselves only to expressions of which they are confident. When they are tested on other more complex things then accuracy is lower. Always remembering that the Population IV pupils in the IEA study are a mixture of *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* and that these results represent a mean (and therefore not an élite score), these results do, however, support the view often expressed by teachers that "it is becoming more difficult to bring the whole class up to the standard represented by the aims of the curriculum plan" (Skolvärlden No. 23, 1971, p.3. My translation). It is with this in mind that suggestions have been made for special groups for low-achievers and why pleas have been made for more individual instruction (See *infra* Mastery Learning).

However, if the results are compared with the main aims of the curriculum plan which concentrate first on the understanding of speech and writing and secondly on the ability to speak and write English then the results achieved in "global" comprehension of speech and writing are satisfactory, as are those to do with the production of the basic sounds of English. However, the low result achieved by the average pupil in the

production of correct verb forms in speech is the least satisfactory result of all the scores. A consolation, perhaps, is that the scores for identical tests of both populations show a markedly better result at the Population IV level in all cases except in the Discrimination of Sounds section. Considering the basic sounds involved in this test this is also an unsatisfactory result, and it is of interest to note that in both populations the sounds that gave the greatest difficulty were: p*ear* and *j*et. In both populations the distractors chosen as correct were: p*ee*r and *y*et.
A Comparison of Population II and Population IV test results is given in Table VI:44.

Table VI:44 Comparison of Swedish Population II and Population IV Results on Identical Cognitive Tests

	Identical Test	Pop II	Pop IV
Listening:			
	Discrimination of Sounds	66.7 %	70.8 %
Speaking:			
	Structural Control (tenses)	42.5 %	65.0 %
	Oral Reading	86.0 %	94.0 %
	Fluency A:		
	Volume (clauses)	5.7	8.9
	Accuracy: Grammar	77.3 %	86.7 %
	Vocabulary	80.2 %	89.6 %
	Pronunciation	82.6 %	87.0 %
Writing:			
	Tenses, Structures and Word Order	45.8 %	81.6 %
	Composition: Volume (clauses)	15.9	22.4
	Accuracy: Grammar	79.8 %	85. 8 %
	Vocabulary	85.7 %	90.4 %
	Spelling	84.0 %	91.9 %

Volume of response can also be compared as between the two populations and these figures are presented in Table VI:45.
It is interesting to note the greater volume in response in Population IV in both Speech and Writing when the *grundskolan* Grades 7 and 8 results are compared to those at the *fackskolan/gymnasium* level. However, it is not satisfactory that the average volume of response was still so low at the higher level after so many hours of English instruction. The figures in Table VI:45, however, show the range of ability in classes particularly at the Population IV level.

Table VI:45 Comparison of Volume of Production in Speech (Fluency) and Writing (Composition) Swedish Students, Populations II and IV

Speech No. of int. clauses	% of pupils producing this: Fluency A Population II		% of pupils producing this: Fluency A		Fluency B Population IV
1– 5	55.5		20.0		9.0
6–10	40.6		58.5		35.4
11–15	2.6		12.9		30.8
16	1.3	(16–30 int.cl.)	8.6	(16–20)	14.1
				(21–25)	2.9
				(26–30)	7.8

No. of int. clauses *Writing*	% of pupils producing this: Population II Composition		% of pupils producing this: Population IV Composition
1– 5	6.7		0.5
6–10	17.3		4.1
11–15	27.3		10.5
16–20	22.7		20.4
21–25	13.4		30.2
26–30	8.2		25.5
31–35	3.4		8.3
36–45	1.0	(36–41 int.cl.)	0.4
		(69 int.cl.)	0.1

The maximum number of intelligible clauses produced by Population II pupils in Speech (Fluency A) was 16 and this was produced by 3 pupils (1.3 %) whereas 7 students (3.1 %) at the Population IV level produced 30 clauses or more. (It should be remembered that the maximum number of clauses counted in Speech, Fluency was 30). In Fluency B 15 Population IV students produced 30 or more clauses (7.1 %). In Writing (Composition) 2 students at the Population II level (0.1 %) produced 45 clauses and at the Population IV level 1 student (0.1 %) produced 69 clauses. (It should be noted that 200 words was the limit for the Composition).

Again, and even more so than in Population II, the four skills at the Population IV level do not correlate highly amongst each other; but, as with Population II, the recognition skills correlate better with each other and with "guided" production than they do with "free" production. In Table VI:46 each correlation represents the relationship between two measures on the same individuals. The number responding to each measure is the weighted number used in computing the correlations.

Table VI:46 Intercorrelations of Cognitive Measures: Swedish Students, Population IV

	1	2	3	4	5	Number responding to each measure
1. English Reading	–	.62	.43	.64	.41	1619
2. English Listening		–	.41	.51	.34	1588
3. Total Speaking			–	.30	.24	204
4. Writing 1 (Tenses, Structures and Word Order)				–	.47	1526
5. Writing 2 (Composition)					–	1489

Source: Lewis & Massad (1975) Table 4.21

As for Population II, the lowest correlation is between Total Speaking and Writing (Composition) which again supports the statements that "free" writing is more complex than speech and that practice of the skill itself is needed if a high standard in "free" writing is to be achieved.

Finally, it should again be remembered that Population IV was a mixture of *fackskolan* and *gymnasium* pupils. However, it can be noted now that students of English in the pre-university year in Sweden at this time had reached a high standard internationally, but that the average pupil had not yet completely mastered the basic tenses in speech production nor the more complicated structures (even for recognition) in grammar and stress. Discrimination of certain sounds was weak. Basic pronunciation was of a high standard and so was global comprehension of speech and writing.

In order to test Listening Comprehension more stringently, however, it was necessary to take a special sample of *gymnasium* pupils and give them a specially constructed test. The construction and behaviour of this test is reported in the next chapter.

Chapter VII

THE SPECIAL LISTENING COMPREHENSION TEST

Countries in the IEA survey could also choose National Options, and an option chosen in Sweden was a Listening Comprehension Test for *gymnasium* pupils. The test was constructed by this author on the following basis:

1) The test should be task performance in the sense that it should consist of the types of spoken English that could reasonably be expected to confront the advanced student through modern methods of communication and would therefore represent the sorts of English that may well be heard on radio or television.
2) Not only Spoken Prose but Conversation (Abercrombie, 1965) should be used for the items.
3) The memory factor should be reduced as much as possible and therefore the questions should come immediately after the speech the question refers to.
4) The voices used should not be those of teachers or actors but of "real" live people taking part in their daily business.

This agrees with the recommendations of the Ostia Conference (1966) on Listening Comprehension Tests, as does also the fact that this was a multiple-choice test with four alternatives for each question. Except in three cases, where the question was written on the question paper, all the questions were oral. After discussion with colleagues at the English Department of Stockholm University, the author constructed this Listening Comprehension Test which was first administered to university students in the Spring of 1970. The results of this exploratory study (reported below) seemed to warrant this test being accepted by the National Board of Education for the Special Listening National Option at the *gymnasium* level.

Description of the test

The test consisted of 25 items timed as follows:

Time of speech for each item	*Speaker*
Item 1: 60 seconds	President Johnson: American
Item 2: 58 seconds	A Czech student
Item 3: 25 seconds	Roy Jenkins (at the time Chanceller of the Exchequer): English
Item 4: 21 seconds	Roy Jenkins
Item 5: 49 seconds	Enoch Powell: prominent political figure: English
Item 6: 11 seconds	Quintin Hogg (now Lord Hailsham: prominent political figure): English
Item 7: 12 seconds	Edward Heath: Leader of the Opposition: English
Item 8: 18 seconds	Edward Heath
Item 9: 44 seconds	Stokeley Carmichael: prominent American Negro spokesman
Item 10: 27 seconds	An English university girl student
Item 11: 50 seconds	Malcolm Muggeridge: English writer and television personality
Item 12: 40 seconds	A French professor
Item 13: 19 seconds	A B.B.C. news commentator: English

Time of speech for each item	*Speaker*
Item 14: 27 seconds	Lady Antonia Fraser: historian: English
Item 15: 30 seconds	George Thomson: the Commonwealth Secretary: Scottish
Item 16: 37 seconds	Extract from a sketch in the "David Frost TV Show": English
Item 17: 12 seconds	Extract from a sketch in the "David Frost TV Show": English
Item 18: 53 seconds	Extract from a sketch in the "David Frost TV Show": English
Item 19: 55 seconds	Sir Donald Bradman: cricketer: Australian
Item 20: 75 seconds	Commentary on the Oxford and Cambridge Boat Race: English
Item 21: 42 seconds	Mary Rand: athlete: English
Item 22: 80 seconds	Recorded text from Reith Lecture "This Island Now": English
Item 23: 41 seconds	Recorded text from Reith Lecture "This Island Now": English
Item 24: 105 seconds	Harold Wilson: Prime Minister: English, being interviewed by Swedish journalists
Item 25: 53 seconds	As for Item 24.
Pause for answering:	30 seconds
Total length of Tape for Test:	34 minutes.

The following styles or registers of spoken English were included: speeches; interviews; conversation; a sports commentary; a radio lecture
The following accents were heard:
American (Texas); American (Negro); varieties of English RP; Scottish; Australian; foreign speakers of English (one Czech; one Frenchman; one Swede). Both men and women speakers were heard.

The whole test is therefore in line with the recommendations of the Ostia Conference which stated that one of the aims of modern language teaching is "to enable pupils to understand speech at normal speed". This aim was amplified at the Sundsvall Conference (1969) which like the Ostia Conference was held under the auspices of the Council of Europe. At Sundsvall the group reporting on English stated:

> "6.1.1. "Normal speed" is to be understood as covering the whole range from the fairly slow speed that may be used by a lecturer anxious to get his message across to that of spontaneous conversation; it should never be so slow that it becomes unnatural in any respect.
>
> 6.1.2. The pupils should get used to hearing and understanding different voices, young and old, male and female, varying in colour and pitch, representing various accepted pronunciations such as, in the case of English, RP, General American and Canadian, Australian, etc. The extent of the pupils' experience in this respect should be taken into account when assessing aural comprehension. If the testing of different pronunciations is to form any part of external assessment, what is expected of the pupils must be explicitly stated.
>
> 6.1.3. The material used for the development of listening comprehension should cover a wide range. It may be divided into the following categories:
>
> (i) one voice: news items, reading of a literary text, public announcements, messages conveyed by telephone, talks of a general or popularising character, speeches (e.g. political), etc.
>
> (ii) two or more voices: conversation on everyday topics; interview (e.g. layman interviewing expert), discussion, excerpts from plays, etc.
>
> Care should be taken to include examples of normal unscripted conversation with such characteristics as interruption, overlapping voices, hesitation, anacoluthon." (Council of Europe, 1970)

This special Listening Comprehension Test (hereinafter referred to as the SLC Test) seems to cover all the points recommended above with the exception of a news item, public announcements and reading of a literary text.

There is little research that can be reported into listening comprehension and most of it deals with native language understanding (Brown, 1950; Spearitt, 1962; Wilkinson, 1965, 1966, 1968). This research will be discussed later in connection with the findings, but Wilkinson (1968) again stresses the importance of including in listening comprehension tests both conversation and more formal speech and as well also points out the importance of validity, reliability, "the washback effect" and administrative practicability.

The face validity of the SLT is high as all the items are taken from existing television or radio recordings with the exception of two items of Spoken Prose which were specially recorded for this test but were taken from the published version of one of the BBC Reith Lecture series. Further, it adopts one of Wilkinson's criteria:

> ". . . it would seem clear that a test of listening must essentially be based on the spoken language." (Wilkinson, 1970, p. 143)

It was hoped that the "backwash" effect of the test would be high as if the test was successful this would encourage tests taken from "real" recordings to be used and would also stimulate the use of similar recordings in teaching to practise listening comprehension. This is in line with the recommendations of Wilga Rivers (1966) who suggests the following as practice listening material at an advanced level: discussions, plays, varieties of voices and accents and telephone conversations.

Difficulty of the Test Items

The following hypotheses were advanced by the constructor: the difficulty of an item would be caused by one of (or a combination of) the following factors:

a) the complexity of language used
   either (i) the vocabulary
   or (ii) the grammatical structures involved
b) the speed of speech of the speaker
c) the density of thought in the text. This density would be reflected by the "register" of language so that Spoken Prose would be more difficult than Conversation as regards "density of thought" because this "register" is in fact written language spoken aloud
d) the degree of accent of the speaker
e) the acoustic quality of the recording

In accordance with this the items were subjectively rated by the constructor as follows:

Item No.	Complexity of language	Speed of speech	Density of thought	Accent (Degree of)	Acoustic Quality	Difficulty of item
1	easy	slow	medium	2	1	easy
2	medium	slow	medium	3	3	difficult
3	medium	medium	medium	1	1	medium
4	medium	medium	medium	1	1	medium
5	medium	medium	medium	1	2	medium
6	medium	medium	low	1	1	easy
7	medium	slow	medium	1	1	medium
8	medium	medium	medium	1	1	medium
9	medium	medium	medium	3	3	difficult
10	medium	medium	medium	1	1	medium

Item No.	Complexity of language	Speed of speech	Density of thought	Accent (Degree of)	Acoustic Quality	Difficulty of item
11	difficult	medium	high	1	2	difficult
12	medium	medium	medium	2	1	medium
13	medium	medium	medium	1	1	medium
14	difficult	fast	medium	1	1	difficult
15	medium	slow	easy	2	1	easy
16	medium	fast	easy	1	1	medium
17	medium	fast	easy	1	1	medium
18	medium	fast	easy	1	1	medium
19	difficult	fast	medium	2	1	difficult
20	medium	fast	medium	1	1	medium
21	medium	medium	medium	2	1	medium
22	difficult	medium	high	1	1	difficult
23	difficult	medium	high	1	1	difficult
24	difficult	medium	medium	2	2	difficult
25	difficult	medium	medium	2	2	difficult

In the above, Degree of Accent and Acoustic Quality were judged on a three point scale as follows:

Accent	Acoustic Quality
1 = R.P. (i.e. Received Pronunciation)	1 = good
2 = not R.P. but not a heavy accent	2 = medium
3 = not R.P. and a heavy accent	3 = poor

Using all the above criteria (complexity of language, speed of speech, density of thought, degree of accent, acoustic quality) the constructor then ordered the items on five levels of difficulty, as follows, where 1 is the lowest order of difficulty.

Level 1: Item numbers:	1
Level 2:	6, 15
Level 3:	7, 8, 10, 13, 16
Level 4:	3, 4, 5, 12, 17, 18, 20, 21
Level 5:	2, 9, 11, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25

On the basis of this judgement it was decided to include "directional prompts" for Items 9, 17, 18, 22 and 23 and these together with a comparison between the constructor's rating and the test results showing order of difficulty of items will be discussed later.

One further check can, however, be made of the validity of the test and that is in relation to the vocabulary used in the alternative multiple-choice answers (The alternative answers will be found in Appendix D). The curriculum plan states that students should learn a "central vocabulary", but unfortunately does not specify what this vocabulary is. Most Swedish teachers and text book writers are therefore very indebted to the work of Birger Thorén and his Word List: "10,000 Words for 10 Years of English" (Thorén, 1967). This Word List specifies what in Thorén's view is the active and passive vocabulary for the different grade levels in *grundskolan* and *gymnasium*. Thorén lists 5,100 words for "compulsory" learning in *grundskolan* and *gymnasium* together and an additional 1,700 words which can be regarded as "extra" words over and above the minimum course. It should be noted that, as he makes explicit, Thorén does not include the following in his Word List: the articles, numbers, personal, possessive and reflexive pronouns, the modal auxiliaries and the names of the days of the week and months of the year.

There are approximately 100 such words and although they are not included in the Word List they are included in the number of 5,100 compulsory words.

It would seem therefore that a check of the vocabulary in the alternative answers against Thorén's List would show if the vocabulary used there was of the right standard to give a fair test of *gymnasium* pupils' knowledge. However, it must be pointed out that Thorén's Word List, like all similar lists, is not semantic and therefore does not say which meaning of a particular word is to be learned. The question of interpretation therefore means that a check of this kind can never be exact. However, with this proviso, a check on the alternative answers vocabulary shows that the following words do not appear in either the 5,100 words or the 1,700 "extra" words:

tanks, élite, media, civil, a dead heat

The following word is in the list of 1,700 "extra" words: christen

It can be noted that both "élite" and "media" are the same words in Swedish and have the same meaning as in English while "civil (life)" is very similar in Sweden.

On the basis of the above, therefore, it seems that there can be reasonable confidence that both the test and the alternative answers provided a fair task performance test of *gymnasium* pupils' listening comprehension ability in English.

Before describing the results of the IEA National Option Test in *gymnasium*, however, it is of interest to discuss the results from the four other administrations of the test in Sweden, and then later to discuss the two administrations of the test to native speakers.

It has been stated earlier that the SLC Test was originally constructed for and tried with university students of English at Stockholm University. This test constituted the final test of English Listening Comprehension for university students taking 40 "points" in English. The test was administered to four different samples of students during the Spring of 1970 and the results are reported in Table VII:1. Samples U^1 to U^3 (inc.) are so small that only exploratory value can be attached to the results.

Table VII:1 Means, Standard Devisions, N's and Reliabilities for SLC Test, University Level

Sample:	U^4	U^3	U^2	U^1
N	175	45	17	8
Mean score	17.4	17.1	17.1	17.5
S.D.	3.3	3.6	3.0	2.9
K-R 20	.65	.73	.63	.69
Min:Max score	9:25	9:24	13:22	14:23
No. of items	25			

Legend: U^1: the first group of university students to take the SLC Test
Legend: U^2: the second group of university students to take the SLC test
Legend: U^3 and U^4: the third and fourth groups of university students, respectively, to take the SLC Test

The difficulty and discrimination indices for each item of each of the four samples of university students is given in Table VII:2. Sample U^4, for reasons given above, is of particular interest.

Table VII:2 Difficulty and Discrimination Indices for SLC Test, University Level

Item	U^4		U^3		U^2		U^1	
	Diff.	Discr. ($r_p$bis)	Diff.	Discr.	Diff.	Discr.	Diff.	Discr.
1	80.6	0.371	86.7	0.385	64.7	0.461	87.5	−0.065
2	86.9	0.410	75.6	0.566	82.4	−0.144	87.5	0.193
3	38.3	0.304	31.1	−0.065	29.4	0.413	12.5	−0.452
4	34.9	0.460	37.8	0.390	41.2	0.141	25.0	0.789
5	36.0	0.307	44.4	0.415	41.2	0.260	37.5	0.573
6	44.0	0.421	31.1	0.477	52.9	0.446	25.0	0.780
7	76.6	0.342	77.8	0.555	82.4	0.467	100.0	0.000
8	30.3	0.314	24.4	0.417	35.3	0.392	100.0	0.000
9	86.9	0.233	84.4	0.650	88.2	0.368	62.5	0.309
10	96.0	0.187	93.3	0.250	94.1	0.252	100.0	0.000
11	29.7	0.306	24.4	0.488	11.8	0.535	37.5	0.573
12	97.7	0.266	100.0	0.000	94.1	0.334	87.5	0.452
13	77.1	0.238	73.3	0.316	52.9	0.446	87.5	0.452
14	46.3	0.420	42.2	0.393	17.6	−0.009	37.5	0.044
15	71.4	0.359	62.2	0.343	82.4	0.569	62.5	0.661
16	86.9	0.264	84.4	0.210	100.0	0.000	87.5	0.452
17	81.7	0.344	71.1	0.431	82.4	0.314	75.0	0.493
18	74.9	0.404	68.9	0.555	100.0	0.000	87.5	0.452
19	90.9	0.261	91.1	0.242	88.2	0.067	87.5	0.193
20	85.1	0.356	84.4	0.210	70.6	0.183	100.0	0.000
21	95.4	0.213	93.3	0.398	100.0	0.000	87.5	0.323
22	82.3	0.254	95.6	0.301	82.4	0.467	87.5	0.324
23	85.1	0.311	88.9	0.435	88.2	0.187	100.0	0.000
24	81.1	0.391	84.4	0.075	82.4	0.263	100.0	0.000
25	46.9	0.330	55.6	0.337	41.2	0.575	87.5	0.193

The discrimination power of the items is on the whole satisfactory and the levels of difficulty tend to be easy but are fairly consistent over different samples particularly U^2, U^3 and U^4. This together with the reliabilities indicated that the test behaved consistently for different samples at the university level and gave some measure of confidence in it as a test. It was also felt that the U^4 result had sufficient evidence supporting it to be taken as representative of the performance of all these university samples, as it can be noted that for both U^3 and U^4, the largest samples, the items which gave the most difficulty were the same viz.

Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14 and 25

In addition, it was felt that as *gymnasium* pupils and university students had been tested, it would also be reasonable to test *gymnasium* teachers' performance with the same test. Accordingly, in the Spring of 1973 at a Teachers Conference in Malmö all the English teachers taking part agreed to take the test. The outcomes are presented in Table VII:3.

Table VII:3 Mean, Standard Deviation and Reliability for SLC Test, Teachers, together with Details of Teachers' Background

Number who took test: 58	
Number with M.A. *(fil.mag.)* or higher in English: 57	
Number without a degree: 1	
Number teaching in *gymnasium* only: 30	
Number teaching in both *gymnasium* and *fackskolan*: 23	
Number teaching in *fackskolan* only: 2	
Number teaching in *gymnasium, fackskolan* and Grades 7–9 *grundskolan*: 3	
Number of males: 21	
Number of females: 36	
Number sex unspecified: 1	
Mean score: 19.9	
S.D.	3.1
K-R 20	.67
Min:Max	13:25

If the result of the teachers is compared to that of U[4] it can be seen that the mean score of the teachers was 2.5 points higher (i.e. about 2/3 S.D.) and that the range of teacher scores was smaller, by 4 points. the lowest teacher score being 13 as compared to the lowest student score of 9.

The difficulty indices of the items for the teachers are given in Table VII:4.

Table VII:4 Difficulty Index for SLC Test, Teachers

Item	Difficulty	Item	Difficulty	Item	Difficulty
1.	93.1	9.	87.9	17.	81.0
2.	93.1	10.	98.3	18.	77.6
3.	82.8	11.	37.9	19.	81.0
4.	50.0	12.	100.0	20.	87.9
5.	43.1	13.	84.5	21.	93.1
6.	60.3	14.	72.4	22.	89.7
7.	96.6	15.	75.9	23.	93.1
8.	58.6	16.	89.7	24.	91.4
				25.	84.5

As will be seen, the items that gave the teachers the greatest difficulty were:

Items 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14, 15, and 18

Two questions then remain: how did *gymnasium* pupils perform on this test and how did native speakers perform?

It was decided to test a judgement sample taken at the Population IV level by using the *gymnasium* schools drawn for the IEA Civics study. One student per school was chosen at random and his or her class was thereby drawn for the SLC Test. From each class so selected 6 pupils were chosen by the teacher on the basis of low, medium and high marks, 2 being chosen in each category. After adjustments, 209 *gymnasium* pupils remained to be scored as the basis for the results given below.

Further, Bristol University's School of Education selected two samples of Bristol schoolchildren: one of 15/16 year olds and one of 17/18 year olds. The representativity of the 15/16 year olds was established by testing them against the English Picture Vocabulary Test 3 with the result given in Table VII:5.

Table VII:5 Means and Standard Deviations on EPV Test, English 15/16 year olds

English schoolchildren: Age group 15/16
Mean age: 15 years 4 months
N: 136
EPV mean raw score: 34.13
S.D.: 6.6
Mean standardised score: 105.2
Standard deviation of standardised score: 9.7

The test scores were standardised on a scale with a mean of 100 in a normal sample. Therefore this sample of English schoolchildren were an above average group as the mean standardised score is 105.2 and the standard deviation then 9.7 instead of the 15 that would have been expected from a representative sample (Table VII:5). However, this is no disadvantage for the purpose of comparison with Swedish *gymnasium* pupils as long as it is remembered that the English group are above average.

Table VII:6 Means, Standard Deviations and Reliabilities for SLC Test together with Indices of Difficulty and Discrimination. Special Sample gymnasium *and English 15/16 Year Olds*

	gymnasium pre-university year	English 15/16 year olds
N	209	136
Mean raw score:	16.1	18.7
S.D.	3.9	3.3
K-R 20	.73	.73
Min:Max	3:24	8:25

A comparison of the item difficulty and discrimination gives the following:

Item	*gymnasium* pre-university year Difficulty	Discr. (r_{pbis})	English 15/16 year olds Difficulty	Discr. (r_{pbis})
1	77.1	0.404	84.6	0.214
2	84.7	0.434	77.9	0.492
3	49.3	0.227	83.1	0.479
4	40.2	0.513	55.1	0.461
5	23.9	0.402	32.4	0.461
6	51.7	0.480	85.3	0.413
7	76.6	0.470	89.7	0.304
8	18.7	0.308	15.4	0.221
9	85.2	0.371	53.7	0.378
10	93.3	0.209	91.2	0.235
11	27.3	0.217	58.8	0.262
12	92.8	0.354	83.8	0.579
13	54.5	0.456	86.0	0.310
14	45.0	0.355	69.1	0.384
15	51.7	0.512	70.6	0.519
16	89.0	0.224	95.6	0.192
17	77.0	0.340	98.5	−0.148
18	76.6	0.202	79.4	0.466
19	75.6	0.379	91.2	0.242
20	90.4	0.271	93.4	0.368
21	75.1	0.303	94.1	0.338
22	78.5	0.359	65.4	0.523
23	55.5	0.531	75.0	0.388
24	61.7	0.442	77.9	0.537
25	55.5	0.344	61.0	0.362

The difficult items therefore for Swedish *gymnasium* pupils were:

Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 23, 24 and 25.

While the difficult items for the English sample were:

Items 4, 5, 8, 9, 11, 14, 15, 22 and 25

The second sample of English schoolchildren (17/18 year olds) found the test extremely easy as they hit the test ceiling. It is doubtful if their results can be of much assistance because of the poor reliability of the test result (Table VII:7). Moreover the discriminations are often very low or even negative and this could be interpreted as meaning that some individuals may well have been dissatisfied with the right answer and instead looked for something more sophisticated.

Table VII:7 Mean, Standard Deviation, Reliability and Difficulty and Discrimination Indices for SLC Test, English 17/18 Year Olds

N 104
Mean raw score: 22·7
S. D. 1.5
K-R 20 .26
Min:Max 18:25

Item	Diff.	Discr. ($r_p$bis)	Item	Diff.	Discr.	Item	Diff.	Discr.
1	98.1	0.061	9	89.4	0.396	17	95.2	0.304
2	93.3	−0.009	10	99.0	0.043	18	90.4	0.442
3	96.2	0.383	11	69.2	0.372	19	97.1	0.226
4	86.5	0.412	12	99.0	0.302	20	99.0	−0.022
5	60.6	0.377	13	91.3	0.224	21	100.0	0.000
6	98.1	0.337	14	96.2	0.087	22	95.2	0.304
7	98.1	−0.123	15	93.3	0.117	23	98.1	0.153
8	55.8	0.235	16	96.2	0.251	24	98.1	0.107
						25	73.1	0.350

If all the samples are compared and a "difficult" item is defined as: an item where the numerical value in the index of difficulty is lower than the mean score of that sample in the test; then Table VII:8 shows the most difficult items for each sample.

Table VII:8 Difficult Items across Sample Groups: gymnasium, University, Swedish Teachers and English School Pupils

Sample:	*gymnasium*	U[4]	English 15/16	Swedish teachers	English 17/18
Mean score in %:	64.4 %	69.6 %	74.8 %	79.6 %	90.8 %
Difficult items:	3	3			
	4	4	4	4	4
	5	5	5	5	5
	6	6		6	
	8	8	8	8	8
			9		9
	11	11	11	11	11
	13				
	14	14	14	14	
	15		15	15	
				18	18
			22		
	23				
	24				
	25	25	25		25

Discussion of results

A) *The difficulty of test items* was stated earlier as being composed of five components: complexity of language; speed of speech; density of thought; degree of accent; acoustic quality.

On this basis the constructor defined the difficult items in the SLC test as Items 2, 9, 11, 14, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25. In fact the difficult items for Swedish speakers, which caused difficulties at all levels, were Items 4, 5, 6, 8, 11 and 14. All of the speakers in these items were RP speakers. None of the more heavily accented speakers caused difficulties to Swedish listeners (although it can be noted that Stokely Carmichael did in Item 9 to English 15/16 year olds). The density of thought in the commonly difficult items is high only in Item 11. The acoustic quality in all items except Nos. 5 and 11 is good; and only in Item 14 is the speed of speech fast; in the other items it is medium. The only component left therefore which is common to all these items is complexity of language. Before discussing this, however, it would be reasonable to see how the items considered difficult by the constructor behaved. Items 11 and 14 seem to have been accurate predictions and so was Item 25 for the university and *gymnasium* samples and in addition Items 23 and 24 at the *gymnasium* level. Item 2, however, which had the heaviest accent and worst acoustic quality was very easy for Swedish speakers and Items 19 and 22 were easy although Item 19 was spoken fast in an Australian accent and Item 22 had high density of thought, as it was Spoken Prose. However, as was mentioned earlier, on the basis of the constructor's subjective judgement certain "directional prompts" were included in order to draw the listeners' attention to particular parts of what was being said. ("The teacher has forgotten, and the student himself will soon forget, that what he sees conveys no information until he knows beforehand the kind of thing he is expected to see" Medawar, 1967, p. 133). These prompts were spoken in the case of Items 9, 17 and 18 and the question was written out on the question paper for Items 19, 22 and 23. It may well be, as the constructor intended, that these prompts made those items easier than they would otherwise have been and therefore the question of the effect of degree of accent and its effect on listening comprehension of non-native speakers would need to be further investigated as would also the effect of some degree of acoustic interference, and indeed the helpfulness or not of prompts in aiding listening comprehension. None of these matters, however, explain the unexpected difficulty caused by Items 4, 5, 6 and 8. It will be helpful, too, if we look at the wrong alternatives for these items, as well as those for Items 3, 11, 14 and 25, since all these items caused difficulty at both the *gymnasium* and university level. For this purpose, as in the IEA International Report (Lewis & Massad, 1975), the popular distractor among the alternatives will be considered. As there were four alternatives, any distractor that attracted more than 25% replies will be considered not to have occurred by chance.

Table VII:9 Popular Distractors in Difficult SLC Items Across Sample Groups

Sample:	*gymnasium*	U[4]	Swedish teachers	English 15/16	English 17/18
Item no. and letter of popular distractor with % of choice	3B (42.1)	3B (53.1)			
	4A (27.3)	4B (32.6)	4A (25.9)		
	5C (47.4)	5C (41.7)	5C (36.2)	5C (49.3)	
		6D (38.3)			
	8C (67.9)	8C (62.3)	8C (39.7)	8C (75.7)	8C (41.3)
	11C (39.2)	11C (40.6)	11C (31.0)		
			11A (29.3)		
	14B (29.7)	14B (25.7)			
		25B (28.0)			

It was observed in the International Report for English that in both Reading and Listening Comprehension, irrespective of nationality or language background, students tended to choose as the popular distractor an alternative that contained in it one or more of the same words as were said or written in the item stem, although that popular alternative chosen did not express the meaning of what was said or written (Lewis & Massad, 1975). The same reaction can be noted in the above items with the additional note that if students did not comprehend, then not only did they choose an alternative of different meaning to the original but containing the same words, but could also choose an alternative because the word in it sounded like a word in the item text. This is so in Item 3 where the speaker says.

> "We must look beyond the next twelve months. For that period the outlook is fairly bleak."

Question: What were things going to be like in Britain for the next twelve months?
Popular distractor: B) sleek

In both distractors 4A and 4B all the words in the alternatives had been used by the speaker but in a completely opposite meaning to that given in those two alternatives. Item 5 was introduced by talking about the next speaker Enoch Powell as one of those who had spoken about the problems of coloured immigration. In what is said by Enoch Powell he uses the word "communication" but in fact he is talking about the gap between most people in Britain and the small number who speak and write in the mass media. The popular alternative chosen was:

5C) communication between coloured and white people

Item 6, like Item 1, shows the sound qualities of a word being reflected in the popular distractor. The word "slashed" is used in the text, and university students chose alternative "6D) flashed light in their faces," although this had no connection with the meaning of what had been said.

In Item 8, Edward Heath talks about preventing the possibility of fighting breaking out between blacks and whites in Britain. In this he says:

> "I am determined to do everything I can to prevent racial problems developing into civil strife"

Popular distractor chosen: 8C) prevent racial problems in civil life.
Here there is a combination of words *and* sounds in the stem being reflected in the wrong alternative answer which is then chosen.

In Item 11 either wrong alternative A or C was chosen. The words "élite" and "macabre" are used in the text but with a different context and therefore meaning to:

Alternative A: they are an élite leading us to a better future
Alternative B: they are a macabre generation

In Item 14 the woman speaker says:

> "to sustain the people shall we say who are going to be left holding the baby"

Question: Who does she think the Pope should have thought about more?
Wrong popular alternative B): the babies of the future.

Lastly, in Item 25 Mr. Wilson uses the phrase: "I think it'll be a somewhat slow business"

Popular alternative for university students: B) Britain's business is too slow at the moment.

These findings strongly support those in Lewis & Massad (1975), namely that it is not native language interference that causes the choice of wrong alternatives and that unless

there is comprehension of the subject matter the student will tend to choose an alternative that reflects either words or sounds (but not meaning) in the stem of the item.

The choice of wrong alternatives also suggests a reason for the difficulty of Items 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 14 and 25. It was suggested earlier that the main reason for difficulty in these cases was complexity of language. This does not mean in these cases, however, complexity of grammatical construction. Rather it means two things: meaning of vocabulary and idioms; and degree of redundancy. Both are linked. In all the difficult items mentioned the meaning of the utterance is concentrated in one word or phrase and this phrase is only said once. It is not repeated in the same words or in other words expressing the same meaning.

To take vocabulary and phraseology first:

Item 3 depends on knowing the meaning of the word "bleak". Supporting evidence here is that neither the Swedish teachers nor the two English samples found this difficult, though both university and *gymnasium* pupils did.

Item 6 depends on knowing the meaning of "slash" in the sense of to strike with something.

Items 14 and 25 depend on understanding the meaning of "to be left holding the baby" and "it'll be a slow business", respectively.

Item 11 depends on understanding that "pot" and "pills" refer to drugs and sex.

Compared to the easier items in the test, too, all the hard items only give their message once rather than repeating it. It is suggested that Stokely Carmichael's speech is easier than that in some other items because he repeats the phrase "white America" which is what the question is about. In Item 10, the girl student repeats the word "question" several times and this is the clue to the answer. In Item 17, although an actual expression is not repeated, one speaker asks a question:

"Let me get you a drink, what do you want? "

and the second speaker replies:

"Err, gin and tonic, please."

The answer to the question increases redundancy as it helps the listener to understand the direction of the question. As Wilkinson states:

> ". . . the test of prediction (actually prediction and 'post-prediction') asks for the supplying of a speaker's utterance from what the other person in the conversation says before and after it. It seems possible that this ability plays a large part in our listening comprehension." (Wilkinson, 1970, p. 143)

Item 20 shows a high degree of redundancy as the commentator repeats himself several times, and in Item 21 the girl describing the weather says what it was like in more than one way.

> "In order to reduce to manageable proportions the amount of information in any one sound sequence each language has developed a certain amount of redundancy. It has been estimated for instance that the English language is fifty per cent redundant" (Shannon and Weaver, 1959, p. 104)

It seems therefore that the one part of the constructor's original hypothesis that can find support from the testing of this test is that difficulty will be caused by the complexity of language and that complexity should be defined as the unfamiliarity of words or phrases combined with the density of information load that each part of the utterance has to carry. Low redundancy combined with unfamiliar phraseology will cause the most difficulty.

B) *The native and non-native* speaker have been contrasted in these test results because it has been said:

> "All tests of English as a second language should be pre-tested on native English speakers to ensure that the criterion of correctness is a true one" (Perren, 1967, p. 28).

In fact, it appears from the two samples reported here that the control sample of native English speakers should be selected with some care and should probably be at a lower or earlier stage of development than that at which the foreign learner is at that moment. Shannon and Weaver state:

> "The word information in communication theory relates not so much to what you *do* say, as to what you *could* say. That is, information is a measure of one's freedom of choice when one selects a message." (Shannon & Weaver, 1959, p. 100).

In listening to a message in English the amount of choice available is necessarily greater to the native speaker and therefore the choice made may not be the one intended by a constructor of a test for foreign learners. The SLC Test which behaved consistently with Swedish speakers of English at different levels of competence behaved differently with 17/18 year old English schoolchildren whose competence in their own language could be expected to be fairly high. Therefore a control group of native speakers should be most carefully selected not only by their stage of development at the time (so that their choices in language are not immeasurably greater) but also with regard to the degree of attentiveness they would bring to the test situation.

C) *The "backwash" effect* of this test was mentioned earlier and now that it seems that this type of "task performance" test can perform consistently and be constructed in such a way as to reduce the memory factor, it is hoped that further tests of this type will be constructed for national testing and that further investigations will be made into the degree of difficulty cuased by accent, acoustic quality, speed of speech and density of thought; and further consideration could also be given to the use and non-use of "directional prompts".

Spearitt (1962) identified a separate listening comprehension factor and Wilkinson's work at Birmingham (Wilkinson, 1970) supports this. Spearitt also stated:

> "Listening comprehension cannot be adequately measured by tests of reading comprehension, reading, memory and auditory resistance ... it needs to be measured specifically by tests of listening comprehension" (Spearitt, 1962, p. 99).

It should be noted, however, that this work refers to native speakers' comprehension and it is the contention of this writer that special investigation of listening comprehension for the foreign learner of English is needed. With regard to the prominence of Listening Comprehension in the goals of the Curriculum Plan and also to the time given to use of "Tape Recorder – Whole Class" by nearly all teachers it is hoped therefore that this study will provide an impulse for the development of further tests and teaching material of the type described here.

D) *The IEA gymnasium sample* The SCL Test behaved consistently across four samples of Swedish university students and two other samples of Swedish speakers of English. Moreover, as would be expected there is a rising curve of performance from *gymnasium* pupils through university students to teachers in standard of competence in English. To score only .79 of the English standard deviation below the mean for English 15/16 year olds, who are above average, is certainly a reasonable standard of achievement for Swedish *gymnasium* pupils, especially when the task performance nature of the test is taken into account.

Using this SLC Test as a standard of comparison then, *gymnasium* pupils have fulfilled one of the major aims of the Curriculum Plan, namely a high standard of listening comprehension. However, as before, it should be noted that the range of scores underlines the comments that have been made about the range of abilities in the *gymnasium*.

Chapter VIII

CONCLUSIONS

The objects of this study were:

(i) to investigate methods of teaching English in Swedish Schools in May–June 1971 at the time of the IEA survey;

(ii) to relate the teaching methods so investigated to the Language Learning Controversy in Sweden, particularly in relation to the so-called Direct Method;

(iii) to establish whether or not the outcomes of English teaching in Swedish Schools could be termed satisfactory:
   a) as seen in an international perspective
   b) in relation to the aims stated in the Schools' Curriculum Plans;

(iv) as part of that assessment to test Listening Comprehension (one of the major aims of the Curriculum Plan) at an advanced level of English; and at the same time to validate a Task Performance type Listening Comprehension Test for use at the advanced level in English.

The main results of these investigations may be summarised as follows:

(i) It is extremely difficult even for experts to agree on what constitutes a Teaching Method as the Experts' answers to the Questionnaire on Teaching Method show. However, it is believed that the conclusions reached in Chapter III could constitute a consensus on a number of points, particularly those to do with the amount of native language used in teaching and the use of rules to explain grammar. That is to say: there would be an increase in the amount of native language used in teaching in an ascending scale from Leaning to the Extreme Direct Method through the Modified Direct Method and the Eclectic Method to the Grammar/Translation Method; and the use of rules to explain grammar would also be on an increasing scale from LEDM through MDM and EC to G/T.

   However, it is felt by this author that the classification "the Direct Method" should be used with extreme care. If such a term should be used to describe a special type of approach to language teaching then it is necessary to define that term in concrete classroom practices.

(ii) Bearing the qualification above in mind, it appears that an extreme Direct Method was not practised widely or consistently in Swedish schools at the time of the survey. This finding is therefore contrary to the belief expressed by many participants in the Language Learning Controversy which took place during 1969–70. It seems more true to state that teachers of English chose aspects of differing methods to suit their perception of the academic ability of the class being taught. However, the amount of explanation given in English alone and the amount of explanation in connection with pattern practices varied widely between teachers and therefore what sort of approach to English a school pupil received would have depended on the class he was in and who taught it.

   The implications for Swedish school authorities seem considerable. If there is still such a wide discrepancy in approach among teachers of English, is that what is desired, for example by the National Board of Education? If it is not, then the Board and other authorities will have to explain to teachers what unified approach is desired by them and why; it will not be sufficient to decree something through consultants and lecturers in method. Those who plan the teaching of English will

have to take into account not only Carroll's cognitive-habit formation theory but also the possibility that the further along the time scale the pupils progress the more cognitive teaching could become, while at the same time considering whether an individual pupil would benefit more from an associative learning approach or a conceptual approach. It will not be enough to talk of one method or approach for all age levels and all types of ability.

Further, the range of ability in school classes makes it necessary to individualise teaching more and it is suggested that it would be of advantage to low achievers if they were supported by programmes of Mastery Learning (Bloom, 1971). This would also be of help to teachers in their problems with classes of very mixed ability. In the opinion of this author, what is termed in England "the set" system should also be considered and could be tried with advantage particularly at the *gymnasium/fackskolan* level.

(iii) From an international point of view, Swedish pupils at both the Population II and Population IV level had attained a high standard in English, and if all four skills are considered Sweden's performance was the best of all the countries participating in the IEA survey. Considering that the major portion of the variance in achievement in English is accounted for by school factors (Lewis & Massad, 1975), it is suggested that it is greatly to the credit of the teachers of English in Swedish schools that Sweden's high level of performance has been achieved. However, if the "profile" of achievements is studied, it will be noted that the average Population II student did not show a high degree of ability as regards grammatical structures, particularly verb forms. The same was true of the average Population IV student as regards the accurate production of verb forms in speech. It is pointed out, moreover, in agreement with School Inspectors' Reports, that it would be beneficial if grammar in *gymnasium* and *fackskolan* was not based on the text being read but on a systematic course presented throughout the various grade levels. The problems of Word Stress could also be tackled more regularly. The results also seem to give support to earlier findings that each skill needs to be sufficiently practised if it is to be mastered, and therefore if the universities are to demand a high standard in written English it will be necessary for them to spend more time on practising this skill with their students (cf. Dunlop, 1971 a).

(iv) A new type of Listening Comprehension task performance Test, in accordance with principles advanced at Council of Europe conferences was constructed and showed consistency in performance and reliability with Swedish speakers of English of varying levels of competence. The achievement of Population IV *gymnasium* pupils in this test compared favourably both with the aims of the Curriculum Plan and with the performance of English schoolchildren of a somewhat lower age.

It was noticed that the results of this Special Listening Comprehension Test supported the findings in the IEA International Report on English (Lewis & Massad, 1975) that unless there is comprehension of the subject matter the student will tend to choose an alternative answer that reflects either words or sounds (but not meaning) in the stem of the item.

It is stated that the difficulty of items for listening comprehension in English as a Foreign Language appear to depend on the complexity of the language involved rather than necessarily on the speed of speech, amount of acoustic disturbance, or the accent of the speaker. Complexity of language in this context means the degree of unfamiliarity of vocabulary and phraseology combined with the degree of redundancy.

It is suggested that this type of Listening Comprehension is sufficiently valid to be used in schools at the *gymnasium* level and that further similar tests should be constructed and used in the English testing programme at the advanced level. It is

also suggested that further investigation should be carried out into the degree of difficulty in comprehension caused by accent, acoustic quality, speed of speech and density of thought when listening to English native speakers and to foreign users of English. It is felt that such research would be helpful not only in testing but in the construction of teaching materials in English and would thus be of assistance to both methodology and achievement in English in Swedish schools.

Appendix A

A.1 LETTER SENT TO LECTURES IN METHOD
A.2–A.5 SUMMED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRES ADMINISTERED TO LECTURERS IN METHOD

A.1 Letter Sent to Lecturers in Methods of Teaching English:

Dear Lektor,

As you know, since 1971, the IEA study has been gathering material about the teaching of English in Swedish schools and will be publishing its report this year. As part of its report IEA hopes to present information about teaching methods. Accordingly, teachers taking part in the IEA study were asked to answer questions dealing with teaching method. On the basis of these answers it is hoped that it will be possible to build up four "profiles" to describe what approach teachers in different schools have to the teaching of English. As you know, however, there are no agreed definitions in the literature of what constitutes different teaching methods and therefore it would be of considerable assistance to this investigation if an expert population of those concerned with the teaching of English gave their opinion as to what are the constituent parts of different teaching methods, basing their judgement on the same operational items as were given to the "IEA" teachers in their questionnaires.

Therefore we are writing to ask you if you would be so good, as an expert in teaching method, to help us in this investigation by answering the questions on the enclosed form. You will see that there are four columns headed: LEDM, MDM, EC, G/T. These designate:

LEDM	leaning to the extreme direct method
MDM	modified direct method
EC	eclectic (in the sense of taking different techniques from differing methods)
G/T	grammar/translation

It is our hope that you will be able to assign each "operational" item to one or more of these categories. For example, if you look at Question No. 24, it says:

Ange hur ofta lärare utnyttjar följande i undervisningen

A. Sällan eller aldrig
B. Ibland
C. Ofta

24. Läroböcker	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
This MIGHT be filled in in each column as follows:	A	C	C	C

Please note that "lärare" in the questions means "*teachers of English in general*", and *not* you yourself personally.

In addition, it may be that you are, in fact, not 100 % certain about a particular answer that you give, and then it would be helpful if you starred the answer next to the letter given, as in the following example:

24. Läroböcker	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
	A*	C**	C	C

In the above:

* means "doubtful"
** means "very doubtful"

If you would be so good as to help us by filling in ALL the replies to the enclosed, then it may be possible to establish an operational definition of what is meant by the four "methods" referred to above.

A.2 Summed Responses of Lecturers in Method[a]:

Questionnaire TQ 5 N = 16

	Item 24				Item 25				Item 29			
	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
Alternative:												
A	4	0	0	1	6	0	1	1	0	0	0	10
B	9	1	2	1	8	4	4	4	2	6	10	6
C	3	15	14	14	2	12	11	11	14	10	6	0

	Item 31			
A	15	10	11	9
B	0	6	5	5
C	1	0	0	2

A.3 Summed Responses of Lecturers in Method:

Questionnaire TQ 7 N = 16

	Item 19				Item 20				Item 21			
	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
Alternative:												
B	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	2
C	0	3	6	12	0	1	5	12	0	1	4	10
D	8 or 7	12 or 11	10 or 9	1	9	15	11	1	11	15	12	4
E	8 or 9	1 or 2	0 or 1	0*	7	0	0	0	5	0	0	0

	Item 22				Item 23				Item 24			
A	14	12	11	2*	1	3	4	1*	1	1	1	7
B	2	2	3	2	12	9	8	1	2	5	3	0
C	0	2	1	1	3	3	4	4	9	7	5	3
D	0	0	1	9 or 8	0	1	0	5 or 4	4	3	7	1
E	0	0	0	1 or 2	0	0	0	4 or 5	0	0	0	4

	Item 25				Item 26				Item 27			
A	0	0	0	3*	0	0	0	2*	16	10	4	0
B	0	0	2	5	0	0	0	7	0	6	11	6
C	4	4	6	2	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	5
D	12	12	8	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
E	0	0	0	5	16	16	16	0				

	Item 28				Item 29				Item 30			
A	0	0	0	13	10	4	1	1	13	12	11	4
B	15	1	0	0	6	12	15	6	1	4	5	12
C	1	15	16	3	0	0	0	9	2	0	0	0

	Item 31				Item 32				Item 33			
A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	2	2	15
B	5	4	0	1	1	2	7	6	1	3	8	1
C	7	7	12	6	3	10	6	2	3	11	6	0
D	4	5	4	9	12	4	3	0	11	0	0	0

Questionnaire TQ 7

	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
	Item 37				Item 38			
A	0	0	0	1	1*	2*	3*	9*
B	0	0	0	9	10	10	10	6
C	3	4	6	4	3	3	2	0
D	13	12	10	2	1	0	0	0

* indicates 1 lecturer in method did not respond to this item in this column
a. The items referred to in Tables A.2–A.5 are set out in Appendix B, Table B.2

A.4 Summed Responses of Lecturers in Method: N = 16

Questionnaire NBE.
Mean Time Allotted to Different Classroom Activities as Percentage of Total Teaching Time in Class.

Item	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	Item	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
3a (i)	15.31	13.13	10.50	4.40	3a (ii)	7.50	7.19	7.19	3.88
3a (iii)	22.19	17.81	15.00	4.88	3a (iv)	13.44	10.00	8.80	2.19
3a (v)	6.81	9.06	9.69	13.00	3a (vi)	7.63	6.06	5.88	3.44
3a (vii)	0.50	2.16	5.69	14.69	3a (viii)	0.75	3.66	6.44	14.50
3a (ix)	9.56	8.31	7.38	4.34	3a (x)	5.38	9.06	10.50	17.81
3a (xi)	6.44	7.69	7.38	9.56	3a (xii)	4.50	5.31	5.13	8.13

A.5 Summed Responses of Lecturers in Method: N = 16

Questionnaire NBE

	Item 9				Item 10				Item 11			
	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
Alternative:												
A	0	1	2	14*	1	0	0	6*	5	2	2	1
B	0	8	3	1	12	0	1	6	6	6	5	4
C	6	6	1	0	2	10	9	0	2	7	8	7
D	10	1	0	0	1	6	6	3	3	1	1	4
	Item 12				Item 13				Item 14			
A	14	2	1	0	14	3	1	0	2	0	0	0
B	2	10	7	0	2	12	6	0	6	2	1	7
C	0	4	8	3	0	1	9	5	2	9	13	6
D	0	0	0	13	0	0	0	11	6	5	2	3
	Item 15				Item 16				Item 17			
A	12	1	1	0	11	0	0	6	0	0	0	16
B	4	10	6	1	3	6	1	6	2	8	14	0
C	0	5	8	1	1	9	14	1	7	7	2	0
D	0	0	1	14	1	1	1	3	7	1	0	0
	Item 18				Item 19				Item 20			
A	13	2	0	0	12	0	0	6	0	0	0	15
B	3	12	7	1	3	3	2	10	0	6	14	0
C	0	2	9	2	1	12	12	0	4	9	2	1
D	0	0	0	13	0	1	2	0	12	1	0	0

Appendix B

DICHOTOMISED RESPONSES TO QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO LECTURERS IN METHOD

B.1 Definition of LEDM According to Sample of Lecturers in Method Using Dichotomies

Items from Questionnaires TQ 5, TQ 7 and NBE N = 16

How often a teacher with this approach uses:

		Seldom/Never	Often	*Source*
(1)	Text books	13	3	TQ5/24
(2)	Printed Drill Material	14	2	TQ5/25
(3)	Audio-Visual materials (TV), films, slides, radio etc.)	2	14	TQ5/29
(4)	Lectures	15	1	TQ5/31
(5)	Teacher uses students' mother tongue:	Never/Seldom	Quite often/ Nearly always	
	(i) Beginners Level	16	0	TQ7/19
	(ii) Intermediate Level	16	0	TQ7/20
	(iii) Advanced Level	15	1	TQ7/21

(6) Skills ranked in terms of the emphasis that a teacher with this approach would think should be given this order as regards students BEGINNING English. (Each time the skill nearest to the Mean of Responses is given):
First choice means most emphasis given to this; fifth choice means least emphasis given to this:

First choice: Listening Comprehension	TQ7/22
Second choice: Speaking Fluency	TQ7/23
Third choice: Correct pronunciation	TQ7/24
Fourth choice: Reading comprehension	TQ7/25
Fifth choice: Ability to write in English	TQ7/26

(7) Order for teacher with this approach to introduce spoken and written forms of English:
The spoken form of English is learned before the written forms (reading and writing) are presented. Responses for this: 16 TQ7/27

(8) How a teacher with this approach teaches grammar:
The pupils learn to speak and understand by imitating the teacher; from this, they learn to speak grammatically, just as they learn their native language. TQ7/28
Responses for this: 15
Use of a combination of inductive and deductive teaching using rules after practices. Responses for this: 1

(9) A teacher with this approach would:
give greater emphasis to fluency rather than correct pronunciation. TQ7/29
Responses for this: 10
give equal emphasis to fluency and correct pronunciation. Responses for this: 6

(10) Teacher with this approach would: teach pupils the correct pronunciation of English language sounds by: TQ7/30

A. making the pupils listen carefully and imitate. Responses: 13
B. giving practice in imitation supplemented with explanations about how the sounds are made. Responses: 1
C. by not giving any attention to correct pronunciation. Responses: 2

(11) use the following aids in the following way:

		NEVER/ SOMETIMES	OFTEN/MOST OF THE TIME	
(i)	the blackboard	5	11	TQ7/31
(ii)	pictures	1	15	TQ7/32
(iii)	"props" (various real objects)	2	14	TQ7/33
(iv)	Tape recorder (whole class)	0	16	TQ7/37
(v)	language laboratory (i.e. individualised tape recorders)	11	4*	TQ7/38

(12) Percentage of total teaching given to exercising pupils in the following practices, by a teacher using this approach:
(ADJUSTED PERCENTAGES) *Source* NBE/3a

(i)	Listening comprehension (longer passages):	15 %
(ii)	"extensive" reading	8 %
(iii)	Guided speech practice (of the pattern practice type)	22 %
(iv)	non-guided speech practice and conversation	13 %
(v)	Guided writing practice:	7 %
(vi)	Free writing	8 %
(vii)	Translation into English	0.0 %
(viii)	Translation from English	1 %
(ix)	Pronunciation practice, either chorally or individually	10 %
(x)	Study of grammar	5 %
(xi)	Study of vocabulary	6 %
(xii)	Reading aloud	5 %
	Total	100 %

THEREFORE experts' perception of classroom activities in this method:

Reading (ii) + (xii)	13 %	
Writing (v) + (vi)	15 %	
Listening (i)	15 %	
Speaking (iii) + (iv) + (ix)	45 %	
	Total	88 %
Vocabulary (xi)	6 %	
Grammar (x)	5 %	
Translation (vii) + (viii)	1 %	
	Total	12 %
		100 % Grand total

A teacher with this approach would teach grammar in the following way:	NEVER/SELDOM	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS	*Source*
(13) use the method "pattern practice without giving a rule"	0	16	NBE/9
(14) use the method "pattern practice with a rule as summing up/conclusion"	13	3	NBE/10
(15) use the method "memorisation of examples of the grammatical phenomenon in question"	11	5	NBE/11
(16) use the method of "learning of definite rules"	16	0	NBE/12
(17) by means of a systematic study of the grammar book:	16	0	NBE/13

* indicates that one expert did not reply to this item.

(18)	by means of studying and commenting on grammar in connection with the text being studied:	8	8	NBE/14
Use of mother tongue.				
A teacher with this approach would:				
(19)	explain grammar in Swedish alone	16	0	NBE/15
(20)	explain grammar by means of a combination of English and Swedish	14	2	NBE/16
(21)	explain grammar in English alone	2	14	NBE/17
	Explain the meaning of unknown vocabulary:			
(22)	by giving a Swedish translation alone	16	0	NBE/18
(23)	by a combination of an explanation in English together with a Swedish translation	15	1	NBE/19
(24)	by means of English alone	0	16	NBE/20

B.2 Definition of MDM, EC and G/T According to Sample of Lecturers in Method Using Dichotomies. N = 16

Items from Questionnaires TQ 5 and TQ 7.
A teacher with this approach would use:

		MDM		EC		G/T	
		NEVER/SELDOM to SOMETIMES	OFTEN	N/S to S	OFTEN	N/S to S	OFTEN
(1)	Text books	1	15	2	14	2	14
(2)	printed drill material	4	12	5	11	5	11
(3)	audio-visual materials (TV, films, slides, radio etc.)	6	10	10	6	16	0
(4)	Lectures	16	0	16	0	14	2
(5)	Use of mother tongue:						
	(i) Beginners Level	13	3	10	6	1	14*
	(ii) Intermediate Level	15	1	11	5	1	15
	(iii) Advanced Level	15	1	12	4	4	12

(6) Skills ranked in terms of the emphasis that a teacher with this approach would think should be given this order as regards students BEGINNING English. (Each time the largest number of responses closest to the Mean has been chosen). First choice means most emphasis given to this; fifth choice means least emphasis given to this:
(LC = Listening Comprehension; SF = Speaking Fluency; CP = Correct Pronunciation; RC = Reading Comprehension; WE = Ability to Write English)

* indicates one expert did not answer this item.

	MDM	EC	G/T
First choice:	LC	LC	RC
Second choice:	SF	SF	CP
Third choice:	CP	CP	LC
Fourth choice:	RC	RC	WE
Fifth choice:	WE	WE	SF

(7) Introduction of spoken and written forms of English (Number of responses given):

A. spoken form of English learned before the written forms (reading and writing) are presented:

MDM	EC	G/T
10	4	0

B. Spoken forms are presented generally before the corresponding written forms are presented, but the spoken and written forms of the language are learned together:

6	11	6

C. Written forms are presented generally before the corresponding spoken forms are presented, but the spoken and written forms of the language are learned together:

0	1	5

D. Reading and writing are learned before speaking and understanding are learned:

0	0	4*

How a teacher with this approach would teach grammar:

		MDM	EC	G/T
(8)	A. The pupils learn the rules of grammar formally and then apply them by translating sentences from one language to the other.	0	0	13
	B. The pupils learn to speak and understand by imitating the teacher; from this they learn to speak grammatically, just as they learn their native language	1	0	0
	C. By using a combination of inductive and deductive methods; the second language is learned by imitation and practice after which grammar rules are explained to help in formning correct speech	15	16	3

Teaching pronunciation. A teacher with this approach would:

(9)	A. give greater emphasis to fluency rather than correct pronunciation	4	1	1
	B. give equal emphasis to fluency and correct pronunciation	12	15	6
	C. give greater emphasis to correct pronunciation rather than fluency	0	0	9
(10)	A. make the pupils listen carefully and imitate	12	11	4
	B. give practice in imitation, supplemented with explanations about how the sounds are made	4	5	12
	C. not give any attention to correct pronunciation	0	0	0

* indicates one expert did not reply to this item

A teacher with this approach would use teaching aids in the following way:

			MDM		EC		G/T	
			NEVER/ SOMETIMES	OFTEN/ MOST OF THE TIME	N/S	O/MT	N/S	O/MT
(11)	(i)	the blackboard	4	12	0	16	1	15
	(ii)	pictures	2	14	7	9	14	2
	(iii)	"props" (real objects)	5	11	10	6	16	0
	(iv)	tape recorder (whole class)	0	16	0	16	10	6
	(v)	language laboratories (individualised tape recorders)	12	3	13	2*	15	0*

Method Lecturers' Mean Perception of Classroom Activities (expressed as percentages to the nearest whole number)

Activity Source: NBE item 3a. The Roman numerals show which sub-sections of Item 3a are concerned.	LEDM	MDM	EC	G/T
READING (ii) + (xii)	13	12	12	12
WRITING (v) + (vi)	15	15	16	16
LISTENING (i)	15	13	11	4
SPEAKING (iii) + (iv) + (ix)	45	36	31	11
TOTAL	88 %	76 %	70 %	43 %
VOCABULARY (xi)	6	8	7	10
GRAMMAR (x)	5	9	11	18
TRANSLATION (vii) + (viii)	1	6	12	30
TOTAL	12	23	30	58
GRAND TOTAL	100 %	99 %	100 %	101 %

* indicates one expert did not reply to this item

A teacher with this approach would teach grammar in the following way:

	MDM		EC		G/T	
	NEVER/ SELDOM	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS	N/S	QO/ NA	N/S	QO/ NA
(13) use the method "pattern practice without giving a rule":	9	7	15	1	15	0*
(14) use the method "pattern practice with a rule as summing up/ conclusion":	0	16	1	15	12	3*
(15) use the method "memorisation of examples of the grammatical phenomenon in question":	8	8	7	9	5	11
(16) use the method "learning of definite rules":	12	4	8	8	0	16
(17) by means of a systematic study of the grammar book:	15	1	7	9	0	16
(18) by means of studying and commenting on grammar in connection with the text being read:	2	14	1	15	7	9
Use of mother tongue.						
A teacher with this approach would:						
(19) explain grammar in Swedish alone:	11	5	7	9	1	15
(20) explain grammar by means of a combination of English and Swedish:	6	10	1	15	12	4
(21) explain grammar in English alone:	8	8	14	2	16	0
Explain the meaning of unknown vocabulary:						
(22) by giving a Swedish translation alone:	14	2	7	9	1	15
(23) by a combination of an explanation in English together with a Swedish translation:	3	13	2	14	16	0
(24) by means of English alone:	6	10	14	2	15	1

* indicates one expert did not reply to this item

Appendix C

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (NBE) ON TEACHING METHODS

National Board of Education Teachers Questionnaire (NBE)
Item 3a: State in per cent how great a proportion of total teaching time is given to exercising pupils in the following practices:

(i) Listening comprehension (longer passages)
(ii) "extensive" reading
(iii) Guided speech practice (of the pattern practice type)
(iv) non-guided speech practice and conversation
(v) Guided writing practice
(vi) Free writing
(vii) Translation into English
(viii) Translation from English
(ix) Pronunciation practice, either chorally or individually
(x) Study of grammar
(xi) Study of Vocabulary
(xii) Reading aloud

Corrected means

	grundskolan			*fackskolan*		*gymnasium*		
Grade	7	8	9	1	2	1	2	3
(i)	11.16	10.90	11.21	11.05	10.38	10.29	11.00	10.91
(ii)	6.18	6.60	8.19	9.76	11.00	10.41	11.91	14.69
(iii)	12.50	12.89	11.06	11.32	10.38	11.70	10.56	10.05
(iv)	7.47	8.05	9.03	9.59	10.48	9.94	11.55	14.00
(v)	12.19	11.72	10.59	8.14	8.47	7.80	6.97	6.55
(vi)	4.94	5.78	6.41	5.66	6.50	6.00	6.64	6.88
(vii)	4.62	5.29	5.67	5.96	6.75	5.73	5.40	5.62
(viii)	6.59	6.28	6.30	6.85	6.79	5.92	5.88	5.69
(ix)	9.46	8.34	6.49	6.71	5.67	6.04	5.11	4.41
(x)	8.05	8.35	9.77	9.01	7.89	10.00	8.97	6.37
(xi)	8.11	7.60	7.33	7.43	7.51	8.03	7.97	7.44
(xii)	8.66	8.14	7.88	8.48	8.13	8.07	7.99	7.34
TOTAL	99.93	99.94	99.93	99.96	99.95	99.93	99.95	99.95

Adjusted means to nearest whole percent

Grade	*grundskolan* 7	8	9	*fackskolan* 1	2	*gymnasium* 1	2	3
(i)	11	11	11	11	10	10	11	11
(ii)	6	7	8	10	11	10	12	15
(iii)	13	13	11	11	10	12	11	10
(iv)	8	8	9	10	11	10	12	14
(v)	12	12	11	8	9	8	7	7
(vi)	5	6	6	6	7	6	7	7
(vii)	5	5	6	6	7	6	5	6
(viii)	7	6	6	7	7	6	6	6
(ix)	10	8	7	7	6	6	5	4
(x)	8	8	10	9	8	10	9	6
(xi)	8	8	7	7	8	8	8	7
(xii)	9	8	8	9	8	8	8	7
TOTAL	102	100	100	101	102	100	101	100

ITEM 9

9. How often do you use the method "Pattern Practice without giving a rule" to teach pupils grammar?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	2.6	1.1	130	48.5	51.5	19.2	23.1
7 sär	2.2	0.8	215	65.1	34.9	21.9	4.2
8 all	2.8	1.0	120	40.8	59.2	14.2	24.2
8 sär	2.1	0.8	217	73.3	26.7	25.3	4.6
9 all	2.3	1.0	117	56.4	43.6	22.2	12.0
9 sär	1.9	0.7	227	85.5	14.5	30.4	2.2
Fa 1	2.0	0.8	345	76.5	23.5	28.4	2.0
Fa 2	1.8	0.8	205	81.0	19.0	36.6	2.4
Gy 1	1.9	0.7	347	83.0	17.0	31.7	1.4
Gy 2	1.8	0.7	336	87.2	12.8	36.6	1.8
Gy 3	1.8	0.7	315	86.7	13.3	40.0	1.9

ITEM 10

10. How often do you use the method "Pattern Practice with a rule as a summing up/conclusion" to teach pupils grammar?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	2.5	0.9	118	50.8	49.2	12.7	17.8
7 sär	3.2	0.7	210	16.2	83.8	1.4	39.5
8 all	2.6	0.9	115	45.2	54.8	8.7	18.3
8 sär	3.4	0.7	216	8.8	91.2	0.9	46.8
9 all	2.7	0.8	117	41.9	58.1	4.3	20.5
9 sär	3.5	0.7	225	6.7	93.3	1.3	54.7
Fa 1	3.3	0.7	344	14.2	85.8	1.5	43.9
Fa 2	3.4	0.7	203	11.3	88.7	2.0	47.8
Gy 1	3.3	0.7	341	12.0	88.0	1.2	47.2
Gy 2	3.4	0.8	333	14.4	85.6	1.2	50.2
Gy 3	3.2	0.9	306	24.2	75.8	4.9	45.8

ITEM 11

11. How often do you use the method "Memorisation of examples of the grammatical phenomenon in question" to teach pupils grammar?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	1.9	0.9	127	71.7	28.3	39.4	3.1
7 sär	2.2	0.8	209	64.6	35.4	19.1	4.8
8 all	2.1	0.9	118	68.6	31.4	33.9	7.6
8 sär	2.4	0.8	213	56.3	43.7	14.6	8.0
9 all	2.0	0.8	120	72.5	27.5	28.3	4.2
9 sär	2.4	0.9	226	52.2	47.8	14.2	9.3
Fa 1	2.3	0.8	346	61.6	38.4	17.9	5.8
Fa 2	2.4	0.8	205	57.1	42.9	15.1	7.3
Gy 1	2.4	0.8	346	52.0	48.0	13.0	9.0
Gy 2	2.4	0.9	334	53.0	47.0	14.4	9.6
Gy 3	2.3	0.9	305	58.0	42.0	19.0	7.9

ITEM 12

12. How often do you use the method "Learning of Definite Rules" to teach pupils grammar?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	1.8	0.8	126	83.3	16.7	38.9	2.4
7 sär	2.4	0.8	206	54.9	45.1	11.2	5.3
8 all	1.8	0.8	116	85.3	14.7	34.5	3.4
8 sär	2.5	0.8	214	47.7	52.3	9.8	8.9
9 all	2.0	0.7	120	85.0	15.0	22.5	2.5
9 sär	2.7	0.8	226	35.4	64.6	8.4	16.8
Fa 1	2.4	0.8	344	56.1	43.9	13.1	7.6
Fa 2	2.5	0.8	202	51.5	48.5	10.4	9.9
Gy 1	2.6	0.8	345	44.6	55.4	9.6	10.1
Gy 2	2.6	0.8	332	45.8	54.2	7.5	11.4
Gy 3	2.4	0.8	306	56.2	43.8	14.7	8.5

ITEM 13

13. How often do you teach grammar by means of a systematic study of the grammar book?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	1.1	0.4	124	99.2	0.8	90.3	0.8
7 sär	1.4	0.6	212	94.3	5.7	63.7	0.9
8 all	1.2	0.5	121	97.5	2.5	87.6	0.8
8 sär	1.7	0.8	212	84.4	15.6	46.7	2.4
9 all	1.2	0.5	120	98.3	1.7	82.5	0.8
9 sär	2.1	0.9	228	66.7	33.3	28.5	6.1
Fa 1	1.8	0.9	349	76.8	23.2	43.6	4.3
Fa 2	1.9	0.9	208	76.9	23.1	37.0	4.8
Gy 1	2.2	1.0	354	57.9	42.1	30.2	11.6
Gy 2	2.1	0.9	340	67.1	32.9	30.9	8.2
Gy 3	1.9	1.0	311	76.2	23.8	42.1	8.0

ITEM 14

14. How often do you teach grammar by means of studying and commenting on grammar in connection with the text being read?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	2.8	1.0	125	40.0	60.0	12.8	30.4
7 sär	3.4	0.7	213	12.7	87.3	0.5	56.3
8 all	3.0	0.9	122	29.5	70.5	0.8	35.2
8 sär	3.5	0.7	215	7.4	92.6	0.5	56.3
9 all	3.0	0.9	122	32.0	68.0	3.3	36.9
9 sär	3.5	0.6	230	7.0	93.0	0.4	57.4
Fa 1	3.4	0.6	350	6.0	94.0	0.3	47.1
Fa 2	3.4	0.6	207	5.8	94.2	0.0	47.8
Gy 1	3.4	0.6	351	5.4	94.6	0.6	47.0
Gy 2	3.4	0.6	340	6.5	93.5	0.3	46.8
Gy 3	3.3	0.8	315	13.7	86.3	1.9	46.0

ITEM 15

15. How often do you explain grammar in Swedish alone?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	3.3	1.0	122	20.5	79.5	0.8	56.6
7 sär	3.2	0.8	215	17.7	82.3	2.8	38.6
8 all	3.4	0.8	121	14.9	85.1	2.5	57.0
8 sär	3.1	0.8	216	22.7	77.3	0.5	34.3
9 all	3.4	0.8	121	16.5	83.5	2.5	57.0
9 sär	2.9	0.8	229	28.8	71.2	4.4	25.3
Fa 1	3.1	0.8	350	24.0	76.0	4.3	34.3
Fa 2	2.9	0.9	209	30.6	69.4	5.7	27.3
Gy 1	2.9	0.9	352	32.7	67.3	5.4	25.3
Gy 2	2.8	0.9	338	37.3	62.7	8.9	22.8
Gy 3	2.6	0.9	309	46.9	53.1	11.3	21.4

ITEM 16

16. How often do you explain grammar by means of a combination of English and Swedish?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	1.9	0.9	119	73.1	26.9	44.5	5.9
7 sär	2.5	0.9	214	48.6	51.4	16.4	9.8
8 all	2.1	1.0	115	65.2	34.8	33.0	7.8
8 sär	2.5	0.9	214	41.1	58.9	16.4	11.2
9 all	2.1	1.0	123	65.9	34.1	30.1	8.9
9 sär	2.6	0.9	226	40.3	59.7	13.7	13.3
Fa 1	2.5	0.9	340	45.9	54.1	15.0	12.9
Fa 2	2.6	0.8	203	42.4	57.6	11.8	11.3
Gy 1	2.6	0.8	349	40.7	59.3	9.7	12.0
Gy 2	2.6	0.8	335	43.3	56.7	9.3	10.1
Gy 3	2.5	0.8	306	49.0	51.0	10.1	11.1

ITEM 17

17. How often do you explain grammar in English alone?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	1.3	0.5	124	97.6	2.4	75.8	0.8
7 sär	1.7	0.7	214	88.8	11.2	43.9	0.0
8 all	1.4	0.6	118	94.9	5.1	68.6	0.0
8 sär	1.9	0.8	218	81.2	18.8	32.6	1.8
9 all	1.5	0.6	124	95.2	4.8	58.1	0.0
9 sär	2.0	0.8	228	74.1	25.9	31.6	3.1
Fa 1	1.8	0.7	344	84.3	15.7	35.2	2.0
Fa 2	2.0	0.8	206	77.7	22.3	27.6	1.9
Gy 1	2.1	0.8	346	72.0	28.0	19.4	4.6
Gy 2	2.2	0.8	335	67.8	32.2	17.0	5.7
Gy 3	2.5	0.9	309	54.7	45.3	14.2	13.6

ITEM 18

18. How often do you explain the meaning of unknown vocabulary by giving a Swedish translation alone?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	2.8	0.8	121	34.7	65.3	5.0	21.5
7 sär	2.4	0.7	213	57.7	42.3	5.2	4.2
8 all	2.8	0.9	116	36.2	63.8	2.6	20.7
8 sär	2.3	0.6	215	65.6	34.4	0.5	1.9
9 all	2.7	0.8	121	36.4	63.6	0.8	3.3
9 sär	2.3	0.7	228	69.7	30.3	8.3	3.1
Fa 1	2.5	0.7	346	53.5	46.5	3.8	6.9
Fa 2	2.4	0.7	208	55.3	44.7	6.7	4.8
Gy 1	2.4	0.7	351	60.7	39.3	5.1	4.3
Gy 2	2.3	0.6	337	66.2	33.8	5.9	3.0
Gy 3	2.3	0.6	313	66.1	33.9	7.3	2.6

ITEM 19

19. How often do you explain the meaning of unknown vocabulary by a combination of an explanation in English together with a Swedish translation?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D.	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	2.9	0.9	123	26.0	74.0	8.1	22.8
7 sär	3.1	0.7	211	15.6	84.4	1.9	23.2
8 all	2.9	0.7	116	25.0	75.0	3.4	19.8
8 sär	3.0	0.7	218	17.4	82.6	2.3	22.5
9 all	2.9	0.7	121	24.0	76.0	5.0	17.4
9 sär	2.9	0.7	229	21.8	78.2	2.6	18.8
Fa 1	3.0	0.7	344	18.9	81.1	1.7	19.2
Fa 2	2.9	0.6	208	20.2	79.8	1.4	14.4
Gy 1	2.9	0.7	351	23.4	76.6	2.3	15.1
Gy 2	2.5	0.7	338	24.0	76.0	2.1	16.0
Gy 3	2.9	0.7	310	24.2	75.8	4.2	16.1

ITEM 20

20. How often do you explain unknown vocabulary by an explanation in English alone?

GRADE	MEAN	S.D	N	NEVER/ SELDOM %	QUITE OFTEN/ NEARLY ALWAYS %	NEVER %	NEARLY ALWAYS %
7 all	1.8	0.8	122	83.6	16.4	38.5	1.6
7 sär	2.4	0.7	209	57.9	42.1	10.0	3.8
8 all	1.9	0.7	116	81.0	19.0	25.9	0.0
8 sär	2.6	0.8	216	43.1	56.9	8.8	7.9
9 all	2.0	0.7	120	75.0	25.0	23.3	0.0
9 sär	2.7	0.8	230	36.1	63.9	6.5	15.2
Fa 1	2.3	0.7	347	58.8	41.2	10.4	3.5
Fa 2	2.6	0.7	205	45.4	54.6	5.9	6.3
Gy 1	2.1	0.7	352	38.6	61.4	3.7	10.5
Gy 2	2.8	0.7	339	33.6	66.4	2.7	12.7
Gy 3	2.9	0.7	313	27.5	72.5	2.2	17.3

Appendix D

SPECIAL LISTENING COMPREHENSION TEST[a]: MULTIPLE CHOICE ANSWERS

1. a) not to have a party
   b) not to stand for President again
   c) to resign as President
   d) not to accept a new President
2. a) by forgetting Czechoslovakia
   b) by sending armed help to Czechoslovakia
   c) by remembering Czechoslovakia
   d) by sending tanks to Czechoslovakia
3. a) rather grim and unpleasant
   b) sleek
   c) fairly good
   d) cheap
4. a) by thinking only of the next twelve months
   b) by getting out of the habit of thinking of the next five years
   c) by getting into the habit of thinking twelve months is a long time
   d) by thinking of a long term future rather than a short term future
5. a) the difference between coloured and white people
   b) the gap between most people in Britain and the small number who write and speak in mass media
   c) communication between white and coloured people
   d) the minority of coloured people who appear on television
6. a) cheer the black people
   b) christen some black people
   c) attack some black people
   d) flashed light in their faces
7. a) on the whole they disagree with Powell
   b) on the whole they agree with Powell
   c) the majority agree with Powell's views
   d) the majority share Powell's beliefs
8. a) prevent the possiblity of fighting breaking out between blacks and whites in Britain
   b) prevent the degeneration of the white race in Britain
   c) prevent racial problems in civil life
   d) prevent race relations in a developing society
9. a) the older generation of women
   b) "black" America
   c) the Daughters of the American Revolution
   d) "white" America
10. a) accepting knowledge which is given
    b) giving knowledge without questioning it
    c) it should make people question what they are told
    d) a one-way communication
11. a) they are an élite leading us to a better future
    b) they show their opposition by trying to get away from things by means of drugs and sex

a. The tape for this test may be requested from the Institute for the Study of International Problems in Education, University of Stockholm.

c) they are a macabre generation
d) they will have a glorious future

12. a) he felt he had to be a man of action instead of being only a thinker
b) he hated what the students were doing
c) he could not act, he could only think
d) he thought the police should chase the students off the streets

13. a) he prohibited any sort of birth control
b) he said that birth control could be used under certain conditions
c) he prohibited any sort of artificial birth control
d) he said that birth control was artificial

14. a) men rather than women
b) the babies of the future
c) those who have been sustained by other difficulties
d) women rather than men

15. a) Mr. Smith must take back his proposals
b) Mr. Smith must make some big move
c) Britain must put some proposals on the table
d) Britain must move its proposals

16. a) One of them thinks it is very funny, but the other does not
b) They both think it is moderately amusing
c) Neither of them think it is funny
d) They both think it is very funny

17. a) Let me get you a drink, what do you want?
b) What do you think about it; what?
c) Do you think it's what you want?
d) Shall we see what they want to drink?

18. a) He still thinks it is the funniest thing he has seen
b) He has changed his mind about the play
c) He has not changed his mind about the play at all
d) He now thinks the play is terrible.

19. Why were Churchill's speeches so dramatic?
a) because of the mentions he made of the aid which was delivered
b) because of the tensions of the day under which they were delivered
c) because of the sensations of the day on which they were delivered
d) because of the sentences and the way in which they were delivered

20. a) Cambridge sank
b) It was a dead heat
c) Oxford won
d) Cambridge won

21. a) there was a short shower
b) slight rain
c) toasting hot
d) it was raining a lot

22. Why, according to the speaker, did Britain build its Empire?
a) only because it helped Britain
b) only to help people in other parts of the world
c) because British people believed that this was the right thing for primitive people as well as for Britain
d) for purely religious reasons

23. In what way had people started to think about primitive societies?
a) they were different to (and worse than) our own
b) they were different to (and not worse than) our own
c) they were the same as our own
d) our society was inferior to primitive societies

24. a) that it is essential for Nigeria not to be split up on tribal grounds
    b) that it is essential for Nigeria to break apart into different countries according to tribes
    c) that it is absolutely necessary for tribal grounds to be given to people
    d) that it is essential for Nigeria to be given new tribal grounds
25. a) there is good reason for throwing our hats in the air
    b) Britain's business is too slow at the moment
    c) it will take some time
    d) slow business is the cause of our problems.

– – – – – – –

REFERENCES

Abercrombie, David (1965) *Studies in Phonetics and Linguistics.* London: Oxford University Press.

Bergström, Tore (1960) Direktmetod – Ja! *Pedagogisk Debatt* 8, Nr. 1, 20–26.

Bloom, Benjamin (1971) Mastery Learning. In: Block, James (ed.) *Mastery Learning.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 47–63.

Blom, Gunnar (1969) Är relativbetygsättning tillämpbar. *Dagens Nyheter,* March 11.

Borger, Robert & Seaborne A.E.M. (1966) *The Psychology of Learning.* London: Penguin.

Brown, James (1950) The Measurement of Listening Ability. *School and Society* Vol. 71 No. 1833, 69–71.

Burstall, Clare (1975) Speaking and Writing. In: Lewis, Glyn & Massad, Carolyn, *The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Ten Countries.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Carroll, John B. (1965) The contribution of psychological theory and educational research to the teaching of foreign languages. *Modern Languages Journal,* 49 (5), 273–281.

Carroll, John B. (1969) What does the Pennsylvania Foreign Language Research Project Tell Us? *Foreign Language Annals,* Vol. 3 No. 2, 214–236.

Carroll, John B. (1971) Current issues in psycholinguistics and second language teaching. *TESOL Quarterly,* 5 (2), 101–114.

Carroll, John B. (1973) Factors accounting for between-student, between-school and between-nation differences in performance in French as a Foreign Language. *Paper presented at AERA Convention.*

Carroll, John B. (1975) The determination of scoring formulas for writing and speaking tests. In: Lewis & Massad, *The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Ten Countries.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Cast, B.M.D. (1939) The Efficiency of Different Methods of Marking English Composition. *Brit. Journ. Ed. Psychology,* IX, 257–269.

Chomsky, Noam (1957) *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton.

Chomsky, Noam (1964) *Current Issues in Linguistic Theory.* The Hauge: Mouton.

Council of Europe (1966) Conclusions of the Course on Modern Language Examinations in Secondary Education, Ostia. April (mimeo).

Council of Europe (1970) Report of Committee for General and Technical Education. Continuous Assessment in Upper Secondary Education, Strasbourg. August (mimeo).

Danielsson, Per-Erik (1972) Rapport för läsåret 1971–1972. Dnr 2125/72 U, June 5, 1972 (mimeo).

Davies, Alan (ed.) (1968) *Language Testing Symposium.* London: Oxford University Press.

Dunlop, Ian (1970) *Practical Techniques in the Teaching of Oral English.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Dunlop, Ian (1971a) Some Ideas on the University System and the Teaching of English. Jan 8, 1971 (mimeo).

Dunlop, Ian (1971b) Språkvetenskapen och språkundervisningen. *Intermediair,* 5, March, 11–13.

Dunlop, Ian (1971c) New University Courses in English. Sept. 12, 1971 (mimeo)

Ebel, Robert (1965) *Measuring Educational Achievement.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Edwardsson, Roland (1970) *Språkdebatten 1969–1970.* Stockholm: Tema, Utbildningsförlaget.

Ellegård, Alvar & Lindell, Ebbe (1970) *Direkt eller insikt?* Lund: Tema, Gleerups.

Eriksson, Göran (1971) Verksamhetsberättelse för läsåret 1970/71. Dnr 1 485/71U, May 19, 1971 (mimeo).

Exempel på skriftliga prov, Engelska institutionen vid Stockholms universitet, läsåret 1970/71 (1970). Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Eysenck, H.J. (1971) *Race, Intelligence and Education.* London: Temple Smith.

Finlayson, Douglas (1951) The Reliability of The Marking of Essays. *Brit. J. Ed. Psych.,* XXI, 126–134.

Forssblad, Lennart (1959) Betygsättningen och standardprov. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 2, 34–40.

Gage, Nataniel (1972) *Teacher Effectiveness and Teacher Education.* Palo Alto, Calif.: Pacific Books.

Gjötterberg, Tore (1959) Att översätta eller inte översätta. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 3, 87–96.

Gjötterberg, Tore (1959) Översättning – en omväg? *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 4, 124–126.

Gjötterberg, Tore (1969) Språkstudiet och inlärningspsykologin. *Svenska Dagbladet,* July 17.

Gordon, Ian (1966) The Movement of English Prose. London: Longman.

Gouin, F. (1894) *The Art of Teaching and Studying Languages* (trans. H. Swan & V. Bétis). London: Philip.

Hjelmström, Svante (1959) Ut med översättningen. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 1, 15–20.
Hjelmström, Svante (1960) Slutreplik. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 8, Nr. 1, 30–35.
Hensjö, Per-Olof (1959) *Build Up Their English.* Stockholm: Svenska Bokförlaget.
Husén, Torsten (1966) Does broadening of educational opportunities "lower the standards"? *Skola och Samhälle* 1–2, p. 18–23.
Husén, Torsten (1972) *Skolans kris.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.
International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) Brochure (1970), October.
International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (1972) National Report on Stage 3 Testing, Sweden, IEA/B/168, Aug. (mimeo).
Jalling, Hans (1969) Resultat av diagnostiskt prov rörande uttal och intonation höstterminen 1969. Rapport nr. 1 Engelska institutionen vid Stockholms universitet, November (mimeo).
Hyldgaard-Jensen, Anna Lisa (1959) Runt om i vårt land sitter modersmålslärare. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 2, 57–58.
Jensen, Arthur (1972) *Genetics and Education.* London: Methuen.
Kruckenberg, Erland (1959) Ut med översättningen? ? *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 4, 121–123.
Kungl. Maj:ts proposition nr. 4 år 1969.
Körner, Rudolv (1959) Språkanalys och språkriktighet än en gång. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 2, 54–56.
Lado, Robert (1961) *Language Testing.* London: Longman.
Lado, Robert (1964) *Language Teaching, A Scientific Approach.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Lengmark, Sture (1960) Skriftliga prov och objektivitet. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 8, Nr. 4, 120–125.
Lenneberg, Eric (1967) *Biological Foundations of Language.* New York: Wiley.
Levin, Lennart (1969) *Implicit and Explicit:* Assessing Different Methods of Teaching Grammatical Structures in English as a Foreign Language. Department of Educational Research Gothenburg School of Education. Research Bulletin No. 1, December.
Levin, Lennart & Olsson, Margareta (1971) *Learning Grammar.* Gothenburg: Gothenburg School of Education Department of Educational Research and Department of English, University of Gothenburg.
Lewis, Glyn E. & Massad, Carolyn (1975) *The Teaching of English as a Foreign Language in Ten Countries.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.
Liljefors, Robert (in press) *English as a Foreign Language in Sweden: A Technical Report.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.
Lindell, Ebbe (1970) *Främmande språk i grundskolan.* Lund: Gleerups.
Ljung, Bengt-Olov (1959) En metod för standardisering av uppsatsbedömning. *Pedagogisk Forskning,* 20–35.
Läroplan för grundskolan (1962). Stockholm: SÖ-förlaget.
Läroplan för gymnasiet (1965). Stockholm: SÖ-förlaget.
Löfgren, Horst (1966) Försök med en- och tvåspråkiga ordlistor. *Pedagogiska-psykologiska problem* Nr. 29, Malmö School of Education.
Mackey, William (1965) *Language Teaching Analysis.* London: Longman.
Malmberg, Bertil (1971) *Språkinlärning.* Stockholm: Aldus/Bonniers.
Malmberg, Per (1975) *Engelska som främmande språk: en internationell studie.* Stockholm: Liber Läromedel, Utbildningsförlaget.
Marklund, Sixten (1966) Skolans läroplaner – reflexer av kulturutvecklingen. *Skola och Samhälle* 1–2, 46–54.
Marton, Ference (1968) Prov och prestationer: Några resultat. *Rapport 2 Engelska Institutionen; Pedagogiska Institutionen, Göteborgs Universitet,* April.
Marton, Ference (1970) Epilogue: Three Years' Research in Retrospect. *Rapport 20, Engelska Institutionen; Pedagogiska Institutionen, Göteborgs Universitet.*
Medawar, Peter (1967) *The Art of the Soluble.* London: Methuen.
von Mentzer, Carl-Henrik (1970) Tio delstudier från UME-projektet. *Pedagogiska institutionen, Lärarhögskolan i Stockholm.*
Moulton, William (1962) *Linguistics and Language Teaching in the United States.* Utrecht: Spectrum.
Newberry, R.A. (1967) Objective Indices in the Assessment of Essays. *Brit. J. Ed. Psych.,* 37, 403–405.
Nordiska Sommaruniversitetet (1967) Mätning av språklig färdighet, Krets 3. Sammanfattningsprotokoll från sommarsessionen i Nørre Nissum, July 27–Aug. 4 (mimeo).
Norinder, Yngve (1971) *On Status and Developmental Rate in Certain Human Characteristics.* Institute of Educational Research, School of Education, Stockholm.
Palmer, Harold (1917) *The Scientific Study and Teaching of Languages.* London: Harrap.
Palmer, Harold (1940) *The Teaching of Oral English.* London: Longman.
Peaker, Gilbert (1971) Sampling Schools and Students. *IEA Newsletter,* Number 2, May, 3–8.
Peaker, Gilbert (1975) *An Empirical Study of Education in Twenty-One Countries: A Technical Report.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.

Perren, George (1967) Testing Ability in English as a Second Language: 3 Spoken Language. *English Language Teaching.* Vol. II Number 1, 22–28.
Piaget, Jean (1962) The stages of the intellectual development of the child. *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic,* Vol. 26, 120–128.
Postlethwaite, Neville (1967) *School Organization and Student Achievement.* Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell.
von Proschwitz, Gunnar (1963) Pukas språk, *Svenska Dagbladet,* Jan. 9.
Quirk, Randolph & Greenbaum, Sidney (1973) *A University Grammar of English.* London: Longman.
Rivers, Wilga (1966) Listening Comprehension. *Modern Language Journal,* 50 (4), 196–204.
Rönnberg, Sten (1966) Om arbetet med centrala prov i moderna språk (Report for Department L 4:1 SÖ) Sept. 9, 1966 (mimeo).
Sahlén, Björn (1971) Kampen om plats på lärarhögskolan. *Skolvärlden,* 20, 15–16.
Scherer, A.C. & Wertheimer M. (1964) *A Psycholinguistic Experiment in Foreign Language Teaching.* New York: McGraw-Hill.
Shannon, C.E. & Weaver W. (1949) *The Mathematical Theory of Communication.* Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
Skolvärlden (1971) Kvantitet och kvalitet i skolan. No. 23. Sept. 3, 1971.
Skolöverstyrelsen (1954) Aktuellt: Specialnummer för lärarna i moderna språk, Årgång 7:25, 340–342.
Skolöverstyrelsen (1963) SÖ-LHS SP 8 Engelska alt. 2. Uppl. A:6. Stockholm.
Skolöverstyrelsen (1967) Rapport över verksamheten under vårterminen 1967 med nordiska sommaruniversitetets Stockholmsavdelning. Stockholm (mimeo).
Skolöverstyrelsen (1971) Kontaktkonferens skola – universitet angående utbildningen i moderna språk, 9–10 Feb. (mimeo).
Skolöverstyrelsen (1973) Förslag om Betyg. Stockholm: Utbildningsförlaget Liber.
Smith, Philip & Berger, Emanuel (1968) *An Assessment of Three Foreign Language Teaching Strategies Utilizing Three Language Laboratory Systems.* Final Report, Project No. 5-0683. Washington D.C.: U.S. Office of Education.
Smith, Philip & Baranyi, Helmut (1968) *A Comparison Study of the Effectiveness of the Traditional and Audio-Lingual Approaches to Foreign Language Instruction Using Laboratory Equipment.* Final Report, Project No. 7-0133. Washington D.C.: U.S. Office of Education.
Spearitt, D. (1962) *Listening Comprehension, A Factorial Analysis.* Australian Council for Educational Research Series, No. 76. Melbourne: ACER.
Spolsky, Bernard (1965) Computer-Based Instruction and the Criteria for Pedagogical Grammars. *Language Learning* Nos. 3, 4, 143–144.
Starch, Daniel & Elliott, Edward (1912) Reliability of the Grading of High-School Work in English. *School Review,* XX, 442–457.
Statens läroboksnämnd (1965) Cirkulärskrivelsen till skolboksförlagen. July 9, 1965 (mimeo).
Söderlind, Johannes (1969) Språkinlärning och språkmetodik. *Svenska Dagbladet,* Feb. 12.
Thorén, Birger (1957) *Mål, Medel och Metoder vid skolans språkundervisning.* Lund: Gleerups.
Thorén, Birger (1967) *10000 ord för tio års engelska.* Lund: Gleerups.
Torneld, John (1959) Språkanalys och språkriktighet. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 7, Nr. 1, 24–28.
Valette, Rebecca (1967) *Modern Language Testing.* New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
Viëtor, W. (1902) *Der Sprachunterricht muss umkehren.* Leipzig: Reisland.
Vygotsky, L.S. (1962) *Thought and Language.* Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology Press.
Wallström, Sigvard (1960) Att översätta eller inte översätta. *Pedagogisk Debatt* 8, Nr. 1, 27–29.
Wilkinson, Andrew *et al* (1965) *Spoken English.* Birmingham: Educational Review Occasional Publications Number Two, University of Birmingham.
Wilkinson, Andrew & Atkinson, Dorothy (1966) A Test of Listening Comprehension. *Educational Review,* 18/3, 177–185.
Wilkinson, Andrew (1968). In: Davies, Alan (ed.) *Language Testing Symposium.* London: Oxford University Press.
Wilkinson, Andrew (1970) Research in Listening Comprehension. *Educational Research,* Vol. 12, 140–144.
Wilson, John (1956) *Language and the Pursuit of Truth.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Wiseman, Stephen (1949) The Marking of English Composition in Grammar School Selection. *Brit. J. Ed. Psych.,* XIX, 200–209.
Wood, Dorothy (1960) *Test Construction.* New York: Charles E. Merrill Books Inc.
Åkerberg, Bengt & Peters, Günther (1969) Centraldirigerad språkundervisning. *Dagens Nyheter,* Jan. 29.

Printed in Sweden, Gotab, Kungälv 75.15790